A CHRISTIAN PLEA FOR INFANTS BAPTISME. OR A CONFVTATION OF some things written by *A. R.* in his Treatise, entituled, *The second part of the vanitie and Childishnesse of Infants* BAPTISME. In the Answer whereof, The lawfulnesse of *Infants Baptisme* is defended, and the Arguments against it disproved, by sufficient grounds and forcible reasons, drawn from the sweet fountains of holy Scripture,

S. C.

Deut. 4. 37. *Because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed,*
Jer. 30. 20. *Their Children also shall be as afore time.*
Isa. 65. 23. *They shall not labour in vaine, nor bring forth in feare: for they are the seed of the Blessed of the LORD, and their off-spring with them.*
Acts. 2. 39. *The promise is unto you, and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.*

LONDON.

Printed and are to be sold by *H. Allen*, in Popes-head-Alley. 1647.

AN Alphabeticall Table of the Principall things Contained in this discourse, concerning INFANTS.

A

Acts.2,39. *v.*21. scan'd,explained, and unfolded, and the wrong interpretation refuted. pag. 3. ---- 8.12.14,23.

Ainsworths demonstration of Christian Infants. pag.88.---99.

All the glory of Gods house beleevers infants are.p. 104,--- 109.

Antiquity of Infants baptisme, pag.23 61,62,63,115,-122.

Anabaptists doctrine against *Iohn* the Baptist. pag. 83.

Anabaptists against Anabaptists concerning the state of Infants p. 89. in the margent.

Anabaptists baptizing grounded upon uncertainty p.62,63.

A.R. his interpretation of *Malachi*, refuted p. 73,---- 5.

A. R. how hee contradicteth himselfe. p. 76,77,78,80.

A.R. his last conclusion answered p. 164, 165.

B

Baptisme of beleevers Infants,proved lawful.p.15.22.24.37.39.52. 59 63.77. p.85.101.111-115---122.124.126.138.---140 from Circumcision. p. 137-141.

Baptisme passive .p. 86.87.88.

Baptisme Gods ordinance, though acted, and received Formerly in Apostacie. p. 161,162.

Bartholmew babies of A.R.turned upon his hands againe. p.114.

Blessings to beleevers Infants. p, 84. 127.

C

Circumcision what it was,& what signified. p. 19.30.31. and Sealed, p. 145,

And how far it extended.p. 123. and the benifit thereof. p. 144.

Circumcision not of *Moses*. p. 145.

Circumcision upon divers persons, But one thing. p. 144,

Circumcision how changed to Baptisme. p.145..146.

Circumcision Gods, ordinance though formerly done in Apostacie. p. 161.162.

Clergies arguments Anabaptisticall. p. 159.160.

Col. 2. 11, examined, p. 152,

1.*Cor.*7.14. Interpreted. p.65.--- 70.75.78. ---- 81.

1. *Cor.*10. 2. Interpreted, and objections Answered. p. 115.---- 122.

Contents of the former part of this discourse. p. 64.

Continuation.

The Table

Continuation of the Church militant depend on the holy off-spring, and who it is. p. 104. ----- 109.
Covenant made with *Abraham* as he was a beleever, and not meerly as he was a Father, p. 133.
Covenant to Infants, p. 18. 66. 67.
And signe of it. p. 20.
Covenant and faith the ground Administring circumcision. p. 19. 39. 43, 67, 125, 142, 143, 149.

D

Dippings necessity in Baptisme Answered. p. 115, 117. 118.
Doubtfull persons about Infants Baptisme to be borne with. p 60. 61.
Duty of parents. p. 83, 134.

E

Ezra. 10. 3.
Examined, and compared with, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. p. 39. --- 42.
and objections against holy Infants Answered. p. 42. ---. 47.
Equivolence of Ordinances active And equivolence of Ordinances Passive. p. 85, ----- 87, 138 152, 165, 166. Exelencie of beleevers Infants. p. 128.

F

Families of Beleevers God a Father unto. p. 21. 53.
Free grace of God, to the Infants of beleevers, p. 15, 16, 159, 162.

G

Generation no hinderance to regeneration. p. 35. 36.
Gentiles that beleive, one with the jews now p. 21. 22. 30. as a foretime. p. 19 20. 31. ----- 33. 42. 43. ---- 47.

H

Holy Spirit beleivers Infants have. p. 6 24.
Holines of the Infants. p. 49. 51, 55, 57, 65, 76, 163.
Houshoulds of beleivers interested in Salvation, & spiritual outward priviledges; p. 16 ------ 24. 53.

I

Iewes Church state, an excelent Seperated Church, described, and evidenced so to be. p. 29. ---33. 53. ---55. 147. ----156. 162.
Infants, capable of baptisme, p. 140
Infants of beleeving parents, in Gods Covenant. p. 13 ---- 33, 126, 132. 134.
And made righteous in Jesus Christ. p. 4.
Infants of beleevers, equalized with their parents. p. 3, 23, 27, 28.
Infants of belevers, nopower actually to degenerat in their Infancie. p. 10. 27. 154.
Infants of beleivers, Confessers, Invocaters &c. imputatiuely, and how. p. 8. --- 11. 23, 25, 35, 43, 50, 88. 91. 94.
Infants baptisme, acted by God himselfe, p. 15, 23. p. 131, 132.

Iohn

The Table.

John 8. considered. p. 154.
Isai. 22. 21. ----- 24. expounded, and applyed to set forth the excelent State of the Infants of beleevers. p. 102. ----- 111.
how fullfiled. p. 111.
Ishmales right to the Covenant how be understood. and how he had not. p. 141. 142, 152.

K

Kingdome of Heaven, belongs to beleevers Infants. p. 91. -- 111.

L

Largenes of Baptisme, an argument for Infants. baptisme. p. 146. 160. 161.
Luke. 18, 16. 17. expounded, And illustrated by, and compared with, other Scriptures. p. 95. ----- 111.

M

Mark. 10. 14. ---- 16. explained.
Martyrdome of holy Infants. p. 26.
Math. 16, 14, opened. p. 84, 95

N

Noah, as *Abraham.* p. 125.

O

Obedience of parents imputed to their Infants. p. 35, 36.
Obstinate persons aginst Infants baptisme to be condemned p. 61.
Ordinances properly of the particular Church, not to be administred or received, before Baptisme. p. 56.
Orignall sinne, beleevers Infants have. p. 15. how it is pardoned. p. 3, 9. ---- 11.

P

Priviledges of beleevers Infants. p. 17, 22, 66, 67, ---- 84, 153, 154.

Q

Questions of great concernment, about this subject. for A. R. To answer. p. 82, p. 101. 118. 130. 132. 147. 154.

R

Regeneration of belevers Infants. p. 35. ---- 38.
Right to the supper how Infants have P. 85.
Righteous Fathers, Fathers in the Gospel sense. p. 127. 130.
Rom. 2. 28. 29. *Rom.* 9. 6. ---- 8. Opened. p. 149. ---- 151.

S

Seperatists, and none else ought to baptize. p. 1, 2,
Spilsberies allegations, the truthes confirmations. p. 3. 16. 137. 142. 143. 147. 148.

V

Vnbeleevers Infants State. p. 34. 76. 81. 135. 157.

A CONFVTATION OF SOME things written by *A. R.* in his Treatiſe, intituled, *The ſecond part of the vanitie and Childiſhneſſe of Infants Baptiſme.*

In the Anſwer whereof,

The lawfulneſſe of *Infants Baptiſme* is defended, and the Arguments againſt it diſproved, by ſufficient grounds and forcible reaſons, drawn from the *ſweet fountaine of holy Scripture.*

Mr. *A R.*

YOur former Treatiſe (intituled, *The vanitie of Childiſh Baptiſme*) being anſwered, I (according to my promiſe made unto you in that anſwer*) doe now proceed to anſwer this your other Treatiſe (which you have intituled, *The ſecond part of the vanitie and Childiſhnes of Infants Baptiſme.*) And (I conceive) it is the Treatiſe whereof you ſpake in your *vanitie of Childiſh Baptiſme* *, wherein you ſay, that *the grounds which Seperates and ſome others urge for the baptizing of Infants, ſhould be anſwered.* * Pag. 28. 31, 32. * Pag. 2 30, 3

And here (in the beginning of this your ſecond part) you ſay, * *Having formerly treated of the Baptiſme of the nationall Church,* you *have now thought it meet likewiſe to conſider the grounds upon which the ſeperated, and ſome other Churches doe baptize their Infants, which* (you ſay) *are from ſeverall places of Scripture.* But in anſwer to your firſt Treatiſe (*pag.* 27. *line* 26, 27, 28, 29.) I there tell you, that theſe [ſome others] beſides *Seperates*, I know not who they are, and if they are not ſeperated from the unclean thing, they are ſtill uncleane. * Pag. 1.

And though ſuch may bring good grounds for baptizing of *Infants*, from ſeverall places of Scripture; yet they cannot bring good grounds to warrant any *Churches* to baptize, that are not ſeperated from Idolatry, and doe not cleave unto *Chriſt* in puritie, in his viſible way of worſhip.

But thoſe that are ſo ſeperated indeed may [very juſtly] alledge Scripture to juſtifie what they do in things of this nature, for of all *Churches* and people in the world, they are the moſt holy and ſincere, yea and cleave cloſeſt to the *Rule*. And they in baptizing their *Infants*, do that whereunto they are bound by the *Covenant*, which both they and their holy *ſeed* are under.

Whereas you ſay, the *grounds are from ſeverall places of Scripture, eſpecially theſe five, which you promiſe to examine in order*.

I anſwer; I know not what five you meane, for you have not ſo plainly diſtinguiſhed them, whereby wee may know how (in your book) to find them. But (it may be) you have not done it of ſet purpoſe, but through ſome over-ſight; for (in *pag.* 3. *li.* 16.) you ſpeak of *a ſecond* [*argument*] *from* [*places*] and (in *pag.* 3. *lin.* 39.) you ſpeak of *a third* [*argument*] (from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14) The fourth (in *pag.* 12. *lin.* 40.) is expreſſed to be *the fourth Scripture*. As (in *pag.* 1.) *Act.* 2. 39. is declared to be *the firſt*. But (in *pag.* 18. *lin.* 2.) you ſpeake of *a fifth* [*argument*].

Now by this your diſorderly manner of proceeding, it appeares that you doe not performe what you promiſed (in *pag.* 1.) where you ſay, *the grounds are from ſeverall places of* [*Scripture*] *eſpecially the* [*five,*] *which you there promiſe to examine in order*.

THe firſt, you ſay, is that in *Act.* 2. 39. *The promiſe is to you and your children*. But *this Text* (you ſay) *is to no purpoſe in the poynt*.

To which I reply, that this your bare affirmation will not beare the leaſt weight in the ballance of *Gods* Sanctuary: for this *promiſe* ſpoken of by *Peter*, is the promiſe of *eternall life*, and all thoſe who are *heires* of this promiſe, are the right *Subjects of Baptiſme**. But the *Infants* of *beleevers* are *heires* of this promiſe; for ſo the tener of the whole *Scripture* declareth: There is no place of *Scripture* which deſcribeth the bleſſednesſe of the *parents*, but it alſo includeth their *Infants*; yea in this place *Act.* 2. 39. where *beleevers children* are mentioned, *their Infants* are meant.

* *Act.* 10. 47.

As

As shall be more clearely proved in answer to your next objections following. And this being prooved, it followeth that they are the right subjects of *Baptisme*.

But you say, *it is nowhere said of Infants, but to your Children, not promises, but promise.*

To which I reply, that this your Answer is of no weight, for *Infants* are *Children* as well being *young* as *old*, and this great *promise* of *God*, includeth *promises*: for though *Gods* great promise (in generall) be but *one*, yet in particular it is *divers*.

But seeing you say, *it is worthy enquiry to know what is meant by you and your Children*, I will (by Gods assistance) prove unto you, that it is meant of *beleevers* and *their Infants*. Consider therefore that the Apostle doth not onely distinguish them from their *parents*, by the title *Children*, and also from *those afar off*; But he likewise declareth them to be those *children* to whom the *promise* appertaineth as well as to the *parents* themselves: which doth plainly shew that it ought not to be understood, as if it were spoken of [all] their *Children* (both *godly* and *wicked*) but of all those *Children* who doe not degenerate from the steps of their *holy parents*; which *sinne* of *Apostacie*, (or *degeneration*) you cannot justly lay to the charge of beleevers *Infants*, who never sinned actually *: It is a sure truth, that the sinnes of the *parents* being forgiven, the Lord will not impute the same unto their *Infants* *. Originall sinne (I say) taketh no more hold on the *Infants*, then on their *parents*, and touching *actuall sinne*, they are as cleare as their *parents* *. But the like cannot be said of [all] their *children* of ripe yeares *.

Wherefore it plainly appeareth that the *promise* is made *generally* to all the *infants* of the *faithfull*, howbeit not to all their *Children* but onely to such as abide in the steps of their *righteous parents*, amongst which holy *children* the *infants* of *beleeving parents* are not the smallest number.

Seeing then that the application of the *promise* of *life* and *salvation*, belongeth to the *infants* of *beleeving parents*, as really as to the parents themselves, or any other of their *children*. It is evident that they have *right* to *Baptisme*. Wherefore *this text* which you said, *is to no purpose in the point*, you may see to be of great weight concerning the point, and this will clearly appeare unto you (I hope) by that time you have weighed it well.

Consider, (I pray you) how that these converts upon the

* Mr. *Spilsbury* sayth, the word cõdemns none, but with respect to actuall sinne. See his Treat. of *Bap.* *pag.* 11. *lin.* 30.

* Sinne remitted, is not imputed, unlesse it be acted again.

* Exod. 20. 6.

* Ezek. 18. 10, 13, 12, 13.

preaching of *Peter*, *were pricked in their hearts*, *and said unto Peter and the other Apostles*, *Men and brethren*, *what shall we do?* When the Apostle *Peter* saw that they were come thus far, he bid them *repent*; which doth not argue but that they repented before (for they were pricked in their hearts) but now *Peter* urged them to manifest their *repentance*, and sheweth them how they should by *faith* rest upon the *promise* of *God*, and he doth not limit it to [a] *promise* onely, but sayth [*The*] *promise is to you and to your Children* (namely,) the chiefest *promise* [a remedy answerable to their disease*.]

* Isa 61. 23. Act. 2. ver. 21.

And though the promise *was* made unto them, and to their *children*, yet if any of their *children* were a *whoremonger*, or *Idolater*, or a *Raylor*, or a *drunkard*, or the like; the *promise* appertained not unto him. * Therefore by *Children*, he doth not here intend all their *Children*, both good and bad; *for then impenitent persons and true Saints have share and share-like in the heavenly riches*, which were *blasphemie* * so to affirme, that such *Ismalites*, or *Edomites* (though the *seed* of *Abraham* according to the *flesh*) should have right or interest to the *promise* or *seale* thereof; but as this *promise* is *holy*, so it appertaineth and is to be applyed only to those who ought to be judged *holy* persons, * in *Covenant* with *God*, having the *righteousnesse* of *Jesus Christ* imputed unto them: Now that the *infants* of *beleeving parents* are in *Gods Covenant*, and are made *righteous* by *Jesus Christ*, is proved (*in the answer* * *to your first part*) and may further appeare unto you by the former considerations, which I have here related, therefore let *those* premises *there*, and *these here*, be discreetly weighed, and then it will evidently appeare, that this *promise* mentioned (in *Act.* 2. 39.) appertaineth to the *infants* of *beleeving parents*, as well as to the *parents* themselves, though some of the *Children* of *beleeving parents* have no greater a share in this gracious *promise* then the *infants* of both *unbeleeving parents*.

* Ezek. 18. 10. * 1 Cor. 6. 9, 10, 11. Rev. 21. 8.

* Rev. 2. 9.

* Isa. 4. 3.

* Pag. 8, 21, 22, 23, 24, &c.

Your next words are these;

A R. Pag. 1. Pag. 2.

In both these we shall be satisfied if we looke back into the former part of the Chapter, where when the gifts of the holy Ghost were given forth upon the 120. and they speaking in divers tongues, and the Jewes shaking upon, some marveiling, some mocking, and saying, they were full of new wine, vet. 13. Peter hereupon stands up and speaks to the Jewes thus; These men are not drunke as yee suppose, but this is that which is spoken by the Prophet Joel, that in the last day, (sayth God) I will powre out my Spi-

rit

rie upon all flesh, and your sons and daughters shall prophecie, &c. ver. 15, 16, 17. *And immediately when he had thus spoken, he preached unto them Jesus Christ, whom they had murthered, and whom though dead and buried, yet God had raised up, and who being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of his Father the promise of the holy Ghost, had shed forth this which they did see and heare,* ver. 33. *As if Peter should have sayd to the Jewes thus; Wee are not filled with Wine as yee suppose, but are filled with the Spirit, promised to our fathers long since, that should be powred forth in these our dayes, and that their sonnes and their daughters should prophecie, which is now fulfilled upon us their sonnes and daughters, and may be also powred out upon you and your Children, to make you all prophecie and speake with tongues as we doe: for you and your Children are all the sonnes and daughters of the Jewes, &c.*

I answer. All which you have sayd here, is able to give no satisfaction, concerning the matter in hand; for as much as (though you have cited some verses which you thought would make for your advantage) yet you have omitted, *ver.* 21. which is most materiall and pertinent to our present purpose. Moreover, you have not done well in taking upon you to be the *Apostle Peters spokesman* (or interpreter of his meaning) before you had minded his *Speech* better, then it appeareth you have done; for we reade not that the *Apostle Peter* told them, that they and *their Children should* (or might) *all prophecie, and speake with tongues* (as he and some others did) much lesse doth he yeeld such a fained reason (to wit) *because they were the sonnes and daughters of the Jewes, &c.* as you would import he did; which doth not sound according to *truth*. But this indeed you ought to have minded that (in the *Text* alledged) there is something else of greater weight and consequence, then the bare *prophecying* or speaking with *tongues**, for whereas the *Apostle* saith, [*The*] *promise*] he speaketh of that which is *generall* to every *beleever*, both *young* and *old*. The truth of this appeareth from the expresse words of the *holy Ghost*, Act. 2. 39. *The promise is to* [*you*] *and to* [*your Children*] *and to* [*all*] *that are afar off.* [*even as many as the Lord our God shall call*] But to speak with *tongues* and *prophecie*, is not *common* to every *beleever*. Therefore this *promise* (which appertaineth *generally* to [all] *Saints*) is something else then the bare *prophecying*, or speaking with *tongues*. Wee know that *God* can make open wicked men to *prophecie*, and the *Beasts* of the *feild* to *speake* with *tongues*, without giving them any *promise* of *Eternall life* [as may appeare

*See *Act.* 2. compared w ver. 21.

Numb. 22.
23. & 24.
31. 8.
Jude 11.
Rev. 2. 14.
Joel. 2. 28.

Joh. 3. 36.
Ioh. 6. 35.
51. 54.
57, 58
oh. 10 28, 29.
1 Cor. 12. 28, 29, 30.
See Gen. 3.
ompared with
Cap. 4. 16.
Cap. 5.
Gen. 17. 7.
Act. 2. 21.
Ver. 39.
Luk. 10. 17, 18, 19, 20.

Cor. 7. 14.
1. 5.
ke 1, 15.
Pet. 1. 1.
v. 22. 14.
or. 12. 12, 13.
2. 13.
6. 8.
n 10. 12.
3. lin. 24.

peare unto you by the storie of *Balaam* and his *asse* *] whom wee must not therefore ranke with the *women* and *daughters* * (mentioned in *Joel* 2.) or with the holy *Children* (mentioned in *Act.* 2. 39.) for then by the same *Rule, false Prophets*, and *unreasonable creatures* must be *baptized*; which to think would be very absurd. Wherefore it evidently appeareth, that this *promise* is a *promise* of something else then a bare *prophecying*, or *speaking with tongues*.

Consider (I pray you) that *Eternall life* is that which appertaineth to *beleevers* onely *, and is distributed to every one of them *, but so is not *Prophecying*, or speaking with *tongues* *. This *promise* of *Eternall life* was made to *Adam*, and all the *members* of *Gods visible Church* then *, and established with *Abraham and his seed in their Generations* *; and this heavenly and *Evangelicall promise*, is here repeated by *Peter* *, and *applied* to all *beleevers* and their *seed* *.

And though wee should be furnished with the externall gifts of the *holy Ghost*, and evidently perceive the *devills* to be *subject unto us through the name of Christ*, and see *Sathan fall downe as lightning from heaven*; at the light whereof we might have cause to *rejoyce*; yet wee have more cause of *joy*, that our *names are written in the Lambs book of life* *.

This *eternall life*, is a *life* above all *lives*, and to be desired above all things in the world, and the *promise* of this *eternall life*, *Peter* applyeth to *beleeving men* and *women* and *their holy seed*. And though in the same *promise* is included divers things, which *God* distributeth unto some of his *Saints*, and not to other some, yet the chiefe thing *promised* is *life* and *salvation* through *Jesus Christ*, (whereof all *Saints* are partakers) without which all the *prophecies* and *tongues* in the world will availe us nothing.

And though the *infants* of *beleevers* be not capable to *prophecie*, *or speake with tongues*, yet I doubt not but they are *holy* *. *Jeremiah* * and *John Baptist*, were *sanctified* by the *holy Spirit* [in the *wombe* *] and seeing that *beleevers* have the *like precious faith* *, they have also to the *like precious* *privileges* *.

Whereas you say, * *So then by this time wee may see what is meant by the promise* (to wit) *the gift of the holy Ghost*.

I answer; It cannot appeare any thing at all the more for this your exposition, neither doth it yet appeare that you understand the meaning of the *holy Ghost* in this place; for if you did, I thinke you could distinguish between the externall gifts of the *holy Ghost*,

and

and the *promiſe* of *eternall life*. Conſider therefore how that *Peters* application of the *promiſe*, is a reaſon which he yeeldeth of his former ſpeech; *and you* (ſaith he) *ſhall receive the gift of the holy Ghoſt*: [*for*] (or becauſe) *the promiſe is to you, and to your Children, &c. What promiſe is that?* Even the *promiſe* of *ſalvation* and *redemption*, ſpoken of in *Joel* 2. 32. *And it ſhall come to paſſe, that whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord, ſhall be delivered: for in mount Zion, and in Jeruſalem ſhall be deliverance, as the Lord hath ſaid, and in the remnant whom the Lord ſhall call.* Compare with this the words of *Peter*, Act. 2. 21. 39. and it will evidently appeare, that this promiſe (ſpoken of in *Act.* 2. ver. 39.) is the promiſe of ſalvation. *Joel* ſayth, *And it ſhall come to paſſe, that whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord, ſhall be delivered**: And *Peter* rehearſing this *promiſe*) ſayth, (*Act.* 2. ver. 21.) *And it ſhall come to paſſe, that whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord, ſhall be ſaved. Joel* (in application of the *promiſe*) ſayth; *For in mount Zion, and in Jeruſalem ſhall be deliverance, as the Lord hath ſaid, and in the remnant whom the Lord ſhall call. Peter* (in application of the *promiſe*) ſayth, (to thoſe Converts which were pricked in their hearts, and asked counſell of the Apoſtles what they ſhould doe) *The promiſe* (ſayth he) *is to you and to your Children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God ſhall call.*

* Ioel 2. 32.
Act. 2. 39.
Rom. 10. 13.

I beſeech you, weigh the Sentences; He doth not ſay; Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord, ſhall *prophecie and ſpeak with tongues: This is not* [*the*] *medicine which was applyed to heale the wounded-broken-hearted-ſoules, converted at his Sermon*: But he ſpeaketh of that which is of a higher nature, he applyeth a more effectuall and ſpeciall medicine unto them, a more ſingular cordiall: *Whoſoever ſhall call upon the name of the Lord ſhall be ſaved.* And this is that which the Apoſtle *Paul* ſo much inſiſteth upon, *Rom.* 10. where in the relation, interpretation, application, and proſecution of (his text in) *Deut.* 30. 12, 13, 14. he ſheweth wherein the weight of the Saints glory and happines conſiſteth, *Rom.* 10. ver. 6. *The righteouſneſs of faith* (ſayth he) *ſpeaketh on this wiſe: Say not in thine heart, Who ſhall aſcend into heaven?* that is, *to bring* [*Chriſt downe*] *from above*: ver. 7. *Or who ſhall deſcend into the deepe?* (that is) *to bring* [*up Chriſt*] *againe from the dead*: ver. 8. *But what ſayth it? The Word is nigh thee even in thy mouth, and in thine heart,* (that is) *the word of faith which wee preach*: ver. 9. *That if thou ſhalt confeſſe*

Rom. 10. ver. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

 With

with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt beleeve in thine heart, that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be [*saved:*] ver. 10. *For with the heart man beleeveth unto righteousnes, and with the mouth Confession is made unto* [*salvation:*] ver. 11. *For the Scripture sayth, Whosoever beleeveth on him* [*shall not be ashamed:*] ver. 12. *For there is no difference between the Jew, and the Greeke: for the same Lord over all is* [*rich*] *unto all that call upon him.* And in ver. 13. he sheweth further wherein this riches consisteth; *For* (sayth he) *whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved.*

1 Pet. 2. 6, 7. Rom. 10. 28, 16.

In consideration of these things, we may safely conclude; that the promise mentioned in *Act.* 2. 39. is the same promise mentioned in *Joel* 2. 32. & *Act.* 2. 21. & *Rom.* 10. 13. Even the promise of eternall life and salvation by Jesus Christ our Lord.

But peradventure it will seeme strange unto some, that the *infants* of *beleevers* should be thought to be in the state of *salvation*, or to have the *righteousnes of faith*, or to be *confessors* of *Jesus Christ*, or *beleevers*, or *invocaters* of his *name*, considering that *they cannot manifest the same actually in their own persons.* But wee ought to note, that all these things are theirs by *imputation*; it is *imputed* unto them as if they had done the same in their own persons. Wherefore the *Lord* gave them the *signe*[a] and *seale*[b] of the *righteousnesse* of *faith*, which doth really demonstrate unto us, that the *infants* of *beleevers*, have the *righteousnes* of *faith imputatively*; otherwise the *Lord* would not have given them such a *signe*, whereby to distinguish them from those who were not in *Covenant* with him, and had not this *righteousnes* upon them. And touching their *confession* of *Christ*, all the *Jewes infants*, as they grew up to be capable, were to *confesse Christ*; according to this saying of the *righteousnes of faith*, which spake *on this wise*[c]; *Say not, who shall ascend into heaven, to bring Christ downe from above, &c.* And seeing *God* usually giveth *names* unto persons according to their *nature*, *state*, and *condition*[d], the *infants* of the beleeving *Jewes* having the name of *Jewes* rightly attributed unto them, they were *Jewes* (that is, *Confessors*) though they could not *actually confesse*: and the like may be sayd for their *invocation* (or *calling* upon the *name* of *God*;) So it appeareth that the *infants* of the *Jewes* had such a *holy state* and condition upon them, that the *visible imputation*[e] of *holy actions*, was conferred upon them, though they could not act the same. And the very like may be said concerning the *infants* of *beleeving parents* now; And

Gen. 17. 11. Rom. 4. 11.

Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13.

Gen. 22. 28. ver. 3. 12. 11. 8.

Heb. 7. 9, 10.

seeing

ſeeing that *ſalvation* appertaineth to the *infants* of *beleevers*[f], the *righteouſnes* of *faith* is imputed unto them[g]; and therefore they ought to receive the ſigne and ſeale of the ſame *righteouſnes*; for we are to account that *Jeſus Chriſt* (*our righteouſnes*) is a *Saviour* [in a ſpeciall manner] unto all thoſe who ought to be *judged righteous* perſons in *Covenant* with him; and ought not to be accounted to have the *guilt* of *originall ſinne*, but that they have it pardoned and done away through him.

[f] Ioh. 16, 17.
[g] Mar. 16.

But the *infants* of *beleeving parents* ought to be judged *righteous* perſons in *Covenant* with *Chriſt*, and ought not to be eſteemed to have the *guilt* of *originall ſinne*; but that they have it *pardoned*, and done away through him, (as hath been proved before.)

Therefore wee are to account that *Jeſus Chriſt* (our *righteouſnes*) is a *Saviour* unto them in a ſpeciall manner, as well as to their parents. See Mat. 1.

It is certaine, that the rareſt Saint *in the world, though he profeſſe and* confeſſe *never ſo much, yet he* (*being one of* Adams poſteritie) *hath* originall ſinne *from the houre of his* birth, *to the time of his* death, *yea and before his* birth, *he was* conceived in ſinne; *So David ſayth of himſelfe*, Loe in iniquitie, (was I painfully brought forth) and in ſin my mother conceived me, *Pſal.* 51.5. But herein conſiſteth the *Saints* happines, that all their *ſinnes* are *remitted*[h] through *Jeſus Chriſt*; ſo that the *Lord will not remember their ſins*, nor impute the ſame unto them; he counteth them *not guiltie*; he ſaveth *his people from their ſinnes*; therefore is he called *Jeſus* *; So *David* ſayth, that *with Jehovah is bountifull mercy, and plentifull redemption. And he will redeem Iſrael out of all his iniquities*, Pſal. 130.7,8. Now whereas it is ſaid, *He ſhall ſave* [*his people*] *from their ſinnes*; *He will redeem* [*Iſrael*] *out of* [*all*] *his iniquities*. Hereby is meant, all the ſinnes of all his people (in *Covenant* with him) both young and old, both great and ſmall. So *David* ſayth, *Pſal.* 115.12, 13, 14, 15. *The Lord hath been mindfull, of us, he will bleſſe us, he will bleſſe the houſe of Iſrael: He will bleſſe the houſe of Aaron: He will bleſſe them that feare the Lord; both ſmall and great. The Lord ſhall increaſe you more and more, you and your children. You are bleſſed of the Lord, which hath made Heaven and Earth.* And ſo (in *Iſa.* 44.3.) the Lord ſayth to *Iſrael*, *I will powre my Spirit upon thy ſeed, and my bleſſing upon thine off-ſpring.* And (in *Iſa.* 45.25.) *In the Lord ſhall* [*all*] *the ſeed of Iſrael be juſtified, and ſhall glory.* By [*all*] *the ſeed of Iſrael*, he doth

[h] Pſal. 32.1. Rom. 4.6.
* Mat. 1.

not mean *Apoſtates*, for they are not counted for the *ſeed*[k]; but this *juſtification*, and *glorification*, is *promiſed* onely to thoſe that abide in the *Lord Jeſus*[l]; and ſo *continue in his Church*; But the *ſeed* of the *faithfull* [in their *infancie*,] cannot juſtly be ſayd to depart from *Chriſt*, to aberate from his *Commandements*; to *Apoſtate* or *degenerate* from that *heavenly ſtate*, wherein the *Lord* of his mercy hath planted them; therefore they are (as well in *infancie* as after) to be accounted *holy*, *ſpirituall*, and in the *new Covenant*, in the very promiſe of *Eternall life*, and freed from the wrath of *God* and *curſes* of the *law*, and under *grace* and *mercy* through *Jeſus Chriſt* our *Lord*; therefore it is apparent, that the *Lord* imputeth them *righteous* through him; ſo then they are *righteous* by *imputation*; they are *beleevers* and *Confeſſors imputatively*, yea, and all the *graces* of *God* are theirs by *imputation*; and this favour and benediction, is not onely extended to the *infants* of the *beleeving Jewes*[m] but alſo to the *infants* of the *beleeving Gentiles*; *There is* [*no difference*[a]] (ſayth the *Apoſtle Paul*) their *riches* are equall, *they are all one in Chriſt*[b]; *God* is their *God*, and *Chriſt* is their *Saviour* in a ſpeciall manner; He *juſtifieth the circumciſion and uncircumciſion* by his *righteouſnes*[c]; *This righteous ſervant juſtifieth many*[d]; *He pardoneth the iniquities of all that abide*[e] *in his Covenant*.

And ſeeing that the *beleeving Jewes*, and the *beleeving Gentiles*; have equall *privildges*[f]; As the *infants* of the *beleeving Jewes* were, and are in the *Covenant* of *God* with their *parents*[g]; ſo are the *infants* of *beleeving Gentiles*[h]; for, *Jeſus Chriſt is the ſame to day as he was yeſterday, and ſo is he for ever*[i]. *God is the ſame God over all*, and therefore *rich unto all that call upon him* * And ſeeing he is the ſame *God*, *rich* unto all that call upon him. *Beleeving Gentiles* have the ſame priviledges for their *ſeed*, as the *beleeving Jewes* had and have for their *ſeed*; ſo that though their *infants* are all *ſinners*[k] *originally*, yet by the *free grace* of *God* they are *juſtified*[l]; their tranſgreſſion is forgiven, and their ſinne is covered, and therefore they are all *bleſſed*; both *ſmall* and *great*[m], *buds*[n] and *bloſſoms*. *Bleſſed*[o] in their *conception*; *bleſſed* in their *birth*, *bleſſed* in their *life*, and *bleſſed* at their *death*; remaining ſtill [in the *Covenant*,] *branches*[p] of Gods holy Vine. *In the Lord ſhall all this* bleſſed *ſeed of Iſrael be juſtified, and ſhall glory*: Note, he doth not limit it to [*ſome*] onely, but extendeth it to [*all*] not one perſon of them is exempted; for, though they be all *ſinners* by *nature*, yet by *grace* they are ſaved, not of themſelves,

oh. 15. 4, 5, 6. 10.

Jer. 30. 20.
Rom. 10 12.
Gal. 3. 28.

Rom. 4. 8.
Iſa. 53. 11.
Ioh. 3, 5, 6.
Iſa. 56.
Gen. 17. 7.
Pſal. 100.
Exod. 12. 48.
Num. 11. 12.
15, 16.
20. 23, 24.
Heb. 13. 8.
Rom. 10 12.

Num 5. 12.
3, 14. &c.
Ier. 20. 21,
Pſal. 115. 13
Iſa. 65. 23.
Ier. 1.
Pſal. 22. 10, 11
Iſa. 6. 17. 18.
Iſa. 10. 13 14.
15, 16.
Pſal. 14. 15.
Pſal. 100. 5.
Num. 12. 13.
Pſal. 80. 1. 12

ſelves, but it is the gift of God, who hath ſaid, as he liveth, that *he deſireth not the death of a ſinner; neither ſhall the ſonne die for the fathers iniquitie, but every one ſhall beare his own iniquitie*[q]. *Shall every one beare his owne iniquitie?* Then the *iniquitie* of the *righteous parents* (that is *remitted*) is not *viſibly imputed* to any of their *children*, [in their *infancie*.] Therefore thoſe *infants* are to be accounted *righteous*; *For the mercy of Jehovah is from everlaſting to everlaſting, upon them that feare him, and his righteouſnes unto childrens children, to ſuch as keep his Covenant, &c.* Pſal. 103. 17, 18. q Ezck. 18.

For to ſay, that the *ſinne* of the *parent* that is *remitted*, is *imputed* to his *childe* [that *never ſinned actually*,] is an arguing that the *ſonne* ſhall *die* for the *father*; yea, and for the *ſinnes* of the *righteous father*! A flat contradiction both of the *Scripture*, and *Reaſon* it ſelfe.

But it may be, ſome will ſay, that *the beſt beleevers on earth doe ſin daily; yea and that in their beſt actions; Shall all theſe ſinnes be remitted, and not be imputed, conſidering, that ſinne is daily committed by them?*

Anſ. *If they ſinne, they have an Advocate with the Father, Jeſus Chriſt the righteous*[r]; and through him, the *beleeving parents*, who *die daily unto ſinne*; have their *ſinnes* ſo *quelled* and *cruſhed*, that there is no power in the ſame whereby to condemne them; for as the Brazen Serpent was lifted up in the Wildernes, ſo is *Jeſus Chriſt* lifted up for them[s], ſo that the fiery *Meſſengers* of *Sathan*, though they ſting them, yet cannot deſtroy their *ſoules*; and this being *remitted* to the *parents*, & to all *beleevers*, ſhall not be *imputed* to them; becauſe ſtill upon the *renewing* of *ſinne*, they *renew* their *repentance*, and ſo doe cut the cords of *ſinne*, by godly *ſorrow*[t]; But a wicked perſon that is not penitent, hath *the iniquities of his* [*fathers*] *imputed unto him*; *and his mothers ſinne is not blotted out*; *all this is remembred with the Lord continually*[u] and laid upon the *ſinner* that is not *juſtified* by *Jeſus Chriſt*; But the *infants* of *beleevers* (as hath been obſerved before) are from under the *guilt* of *originall ſinne*; their *parents ſinne* is not *imputed* unto them; but both the *originall ſinne* and *actuall ſinne* is fully remitted; and the *infants* cannot be taxed with *actuall ſinne*; they are cleare, they never acted ſinne. Wherefore by all this it appeareth that the *Lord* ſpake not in vaine, when he bid the *parents, chooſe life*, that both they and their *ſeed might live*; for though God *viſiteth the iniquities of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of thoſe that hate him, yet he ſhewes mercy to thouſands of thoſe that love him and keep his Commandments*[*]. r 1 Ioh. 2. 1, 2. ſ Ioh 3. 14, 15. t 2 Cor 7. 10, 11. u Pſal 109 14, 15. * Exod. 20 5, 6

Seeing then it is ſo apparent that the *infants* of *beleevers* are *freely juſtified* and *ſaved* by *Jeſus Chriſt* through his righteouſneſſe, they are under this *promiſe* mentioned by *Peter*, Act. 2. 39. And therefore are to have *Baptiſme* (the *ſeale* of the ſame *promiſe*) adminiſtred upon them. And this concluſion is agreeable to your own poſition, ⁎ (which is,) that that which availeth to juſtification, doth (according to the rule) availe to *Baptiſme*, &c.

* *A. R.* ſecond part, *pag.* 6. *lin.* 37, 38, 39.

Whereas you further ſay ⁎, that *by children are meant ſonnes and daughters, which* [*ſhould*] *prophecie.* This I denie not; But that it is onely meant of them, I doe deny; for, *all are not Prophets* [x]. *Jeremia* was not a *Prophet* till *God* called him. And though he was not ſet about the work, till he was capable to underſtand, and apprehend [y], yet he was *ſanctified in the wombe*, and therefore the *promiſe* appertained unto him then, before he could *prophecie*; even ſo the *promiſe* is really made to the *infants* of the *faithfull*, though they can neither *prophecie*, nor ſpeake with *tongues*. Wherefore it appeareth (by what hath been ſaid in anſwer unto you) that your argument is quite overthrowne, and the drift thereof hath no weight in it to edifie the *ſoule*, nor any ſtrength to prove what you undertooke ⁎, (namely) that by *children*, no *infants* are meant in this place of *Acts* 2. 39.

* Pag. 8. lin. 21.

And although it be ſaid, that the *promiſe* is to their *children*, yet you deny that the *Text* ſpeaketh of their *children* in *Covenant* ⁎, by ſaying, that *this objection* (*that theſe children were in Covenant*) *hath no colour of footing in the Text*; for proofe whereof you bring your own former ſpeeches ⁎, and adde for further demonſtration, ſaying ⁎, that *firſt the promiſe is made equally to them, and to their children, and to them that are afar off. But theſe which are afar off, are not within the Covenant by the promiſe untill they beleeve the ſame.*

* Line 41.

* Line 42.

* Pag. 3. lin. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5.

To which I anſwer; that if it be not meant of their children in *Covenant*, *then is it meant of their children out of Covenant*! But you ſhould know, that thoſe who are out of *Covenant*, are not within the *promiſe* of *life* and *ſalvation*! None have *right* unto the *tree* of *Life*, but thoſe that are in *Covenant* with *God* [z], and thoſe that abide not in *Chriſt*, they have no part in him or his ⁎. But the *infants* of *beleevers* are in *Chriſt*, and in the *promiſe*; and *God is faithfull* [a], and therefore will not breake his *promiſe* with thoſe whom he hath effectually *called* to the *fellowſhip* of his *Sonne Jeſus Chriſt*.

x 1 Cor. 12. 29

y Ier. 1. 6. 10, 11, 12, 17, 18.

z Rev. 21. 7, 8. & 22. 14, 15.

* Ioh. 15. 6.

a 1 Theſ. 5. 24.

And it appeareth by the Apoſtle *Peters* words, that theſe *children*

dren (mentioned in *Act.* 2. 39.) were such whom in visibilitie the *Lord* had so called in *Christ Jesus* for the Apostle speaketh of them in the *time present*, *The promise* [*is*] *to you* (sayth he) *and to your children*: but when he speaketh of those afar off, he hath relation wholly to the *future time*, saying, *and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God* [*shall*] *call*. And so by this he shewed that *God* would be a *God* unto all those whom he so calleth.

Now this calling, I doe not understand to be a bare *publication* of the *Gospel*, or generall *invitation*, which appertaineth unto all [b]; but such a *calling* which is appropriated unto those whom the *Lord* accepteth in the *Covenant* of the *Gospel*, and *fellowship* with his *Sonne Jesus Christ*. That the *infants* of *beleevers* have *fellowship* with *Jesus Christ*, is evident; *Suffer them*, sayth Christ; *to come unto mee, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdome of heaven* [c]. Seeing then that they are declared to be in *Jesus Christ*, who is made a [d] *Covenant to the people*; they are not out of *Covenant*, no more then the *infants* of *Abraham*, to whom the Lord spake, saying, *I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed, &c.* Thou shalt keep my *Covenant* therefore, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations [e].

[b] Mar. 15. 15. 2 Tim. 1. 9.

[c] Luk. 18. 15, 16, 17.

[d] Isa. 42, 6, 7.

[e] Gen. 17. 10.

By all this it appeareth, that wee have no ground to deny that the Scripture speaketh of their *children* in *Covenant*, neither are we to dreame that the *promise* appertaineth to all sorts, or is visibly made equally to *visible beleevers*, and *visible unbeleevers* also; for though in *Gods* secret account, visible *unbeleevers* may be accounted as visible *beleevers* are, and have the *promise* reserved for them by *God* in the secret intention and unalterable resolution of his sacred *Majestie*, who will afterward manifest it visibly to appertaine unto them in his appointed time; yet (these *unbeleevers*) the mean while [in our account, and in their own account,] are not to be esteemed *heires* of the *promise*, or elect vessels of *mercy*, so long as they are not in the *Covenant*; for none are to be esteemed as the *children* of *life*, but those that are *visibly* in *Jesus Christ*; for whose sake *life* is promised to those that choose *life*, and also to their *seed* [f].

[f] Deut. 29. 2.

Secondly (you say) *If they were in the Covenant, by having this promise made to them, then were they of the new Covenant and Church of the Gospel, for there were no other people to be accounted in Covenant with God, save those which be of this Church, but those were not of this Church, but they were afterwards added thereunto, (as appeares ver. 41.)* Pag. 3. line 6.

and

and therefore were not of it before, and consequently notwithstanding the promise, being so to them and their children, yet neither they nor their children were of the Covenant nor Church, untill they did beleeve, although they were Jewes, and so the children of faithfull Abraham.

Answ. Here, I think, you are mistaken, for you would inferre that these were not in the *new Covenant*, before they were baptized and added to the *particular Church*; but then by the same rule, wee may think, that the Apostles baptized and admitted into Church-fellowship, those who were out of the *new Covenant*, and that those Converts (mentioned in *Act.* 2. 39.) were out of the *new Covenant*, when they had gladly received the Word, for as touching their *Baptisme*, and addition to the Church, the Scripture denoteth the same, as distinct from the rest which went before. But you should know, that none ought to be *baptized* before they are in *Covenant* with *God*; Wherefore if these aforesaid, were not in *Covenant* with *God*, before they were baptized and added, as aforesaid, then they were first *added*, and were afterward baptized, and afterward entered into *Covenant* with *God*, which disorderly proceeding is not according to the *Rule* of *Jesus Christ*.

Moreover, If it be admitted, that persons must be first added to the particular *Church*, before they are to be *baptized* (which thing I dare not affirme.) But suppose it were so, yet (I say) it cannot be proved that persons are not in the *new Covenant*, till they are joyned to the *particular Church*, for all those that are out of the *new Covenant*, are not fit matter for it. But that these *Converts* (mentioned in *Act.* 2.) were in the *new Covenant* before they were *baptized*, is apparent by their *conversion* and *repentance*; and that the blessed *promise* of *God* in the free pardon of their *sinnes*, was tightly applyed unto them, and their seed, and this is the *new Covenant*, That *God* will be our *God*, and wee shall be his *people*, and that he will be mercifull unto us, in forgiving us all our *iniquities*, &c. *Heb.* 8. 10, 11, 12. And so *David* sayth, *O blessed is he whose transgression is pardoned, and whose sinne is covered. O blessed is the man, to whom the Lord imputeth not sinne* *. And *Paul* explaineth it to be a *Righteousnesse imputed* [without workes] *Rom.* 4. 6. And that this *righteousnes* of *faith* is *visibly* imputed to the *infants* of *beleevers* (as hath been heretofore) is cleare from *Act.* 2. 39. compared with other *Scriptures*, and therefore I conclude, they are *beleevers imputatively*, and in the *new Covenant*, and ought to be baptized.

See *Gen.* 17. 7. *Rev.* 21. 3.

* *Psal.* 32. 1, 2.

Now

Now that persons are in the *promise* or *new Covenant* visibly before they have *faith*, I suppose, no well informed *Christian* will affirme. But to say, that *true visible beleevers*, though unbaptized, are not in the *new Covenant*; till they be baptized and added, as before specified, it sheweth a great deale of ignorance, (at the best) in him that so affirmeth.

NExt, you say, *Their second Argument is from those places which speake of baptizing whole households.*

To which I answer. It is certaine that divers places of *Scripture* speake of *baptizing* whole *households*. And it would argue weaknes and presumption in us to affirme, that there were no *infants* in those *families*, except wee could prove the same; which if there were none, it maketh nothing against the *baptizing* of *infants*. I hope we are not *ignorant* (at least wee are admonished not to be *ignorant*) 1 Cor. 10.1, 2
that *God baptized* the *children* of *Israel* in the *Sea*; in which act he really declared who are the *right subjects* of *Baptisme*, namely, *Beleeving parents*, and their *infants* with them, *Jewes* and Prosolytes; such as were the *right subjects* of *Circumcision**: And if wee doe dis- * Gen. 7. 9. 14
creetly weigh the *great* and *generall Commission* of *Jesus Christ* (given Exod. 12. 48
when he ascended upon high) it will give great light to this point; for 49
it declareth that all *Nations* were commanded to be made Disciples and those that were made Disciples of Christ, he commanded to be baptized, so soone as it appeared that the *Application* of the *Gospel* appertained unto them; *Goe*, (sayth Christ) *teach all Nations, baptizing them, &c**. *Goe yee into all the world, and preach the Gospel to* * Mat. 28. 1
every creature; *He that beleeveth and is baptized, shall be saved*; *and he* * Mar. 16. 1
*that beleeveth not, shall be damned**. Now I hope you will not denie 1
infants to be part of the *Nations*, or to be part of the number of Creatures spoken of here, for whom an immortall state is prepared; for it is a sure truth, that they are *reasonable creatures*, and comprehended in these words [*Every Creature*.] Consider then how that the *purest infants* of the *holiest parents* are by *nature* the *children* of *wrath*, *Conceived in sinne*, *and brought forth in iniquitie*, and have *Originall sinne* cleaving unto them till their *change come*, (I mean, till the time of their death or dissolution) and are by *nature* enemies against *God*, so deeply *stained* with *sinne*, that nothing in the world is * Psal. 49 7.
effectuall to cleanse them therefrom *, but the *crimson bloud* of their Rev. 1. 5.
crucified Saviour; naturall corruption from their conception, is in-

herent in them, and cannot be ſubdued but by the free *grace* of *God*. Now to ſay, that God hath not ordained ſufficiēt means* for their recovery, is in effect to caſt them all downe to hell, and ſo to hudwinke the eyes of *Charitie*, (and ſo to place them with *dogges* and *whoremongers* without*) or elſe to *judge* they are *ſaved* without the *means*, and that they ſo enter into the kingdome of *heaven*, even without *Chriſt*! without *faith*! without *holines*! yea without *regeneration*! which to affirme is contrary unto the Scripture, for *Chriſt Jeſus* is the onely *way*, and *doore* of entereance to *God* the *Father*. He is the *ladder* of *life*, by which all the *Saints* muſt aſcend unto their *manſion-houſes*. *Chriſt* is the onely *light*, who giveth *light* unto all that abide in him. *Who being the brightnes of his Fathers glory, and the expreſſe Image of his perſon*, freely diſtributeth thoſe gifts which he hath *freely* received of his *Father*, and doth not in the leaſt leſſen the *Saints* priviledges, but in his *rich mercy* beſtoweth his rich gifts upon his *Saints* for their good and benefit, though by *nature* they are rebellious unto him. *Thou haſt* (ſayth *David*) *received gifts for men, yea for the rebellious alſo, that the Lord God might dwell among them**: for as much then as the *Lord Jeſus* hath *received gifts for the rebellious, that God might dwell amongſt them*; and that the *infants* of *beleevers* are *rebellious* by *nature*; Surely *God* never ordained (though they die in their *infancie*) that they ſhould be *ſaved* without the *gifts* there ſpoken of, which are neceſſary for them, and therefore we muſt confeſſe, that they are the *creatures* comprehended in the *generall Commiſſion*, given by *Jeſus Chriſt*, when he aſcended up on high, when he ſaid, *Goe teach all nations, baptizing them, &c. Goe preach the Goſpel to every creature. He that beleeveth and is baptized, ſhall be ſaved, &c.* Hereby is meant that the generall offer of the *Goſpel* ſhould be tendred to all, and that thoſe rebellious perſons who were cōtent to *ſubject themſelves* unto the yoke of *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſhould have the *Goſpel* applyed unto them, and alſo the *ſeale* of the *Covenant* thereof; and ſo all beleeving *parents*, and their *infants*, though *rebellious* by nature, ſhould all receive the ſame *precious priviledges* and *prerogatives*, as were granted to *Abraham* and his *infants*, in whom the *Lord* did Evangelically declare that *all the families of the earth ſhould be bleſſed**; and to this *Chriſt Jeſus* alluded when he applyed the *Goſpel* to *Zacheus* his *family*, *houſe*, or *houſhold*, ſaying, *This day is ſalvation come to this houſe, for ſo much as he alſo is the ſonne of Abraham. For the Sonne of man is come to ſeeke and to ſave*

that

Mr. *Spilsbury* ayth, that the *Word of God* hews that he hath elected erſons to the eans as well s to the end, eing the way nto the ſame. And that was he Adoption f ſonnes, and o be called & uſtified by beeeving in Ieus Chriſt. See is Treatiſe of ap. pag. 3. lin. 1, 42, 43, 44.

Pſal. 68. 18.

cn. 17. xod. 12. 48. Gen. 12. 3. al. 3. 8, 9.

that which was lost *. And this was written for our sakes *; To the intent that wee should know that every *beleever* is the childe of *Abraham* *, & that every beleeving *parent* hath the same *precious privileges*, as *Isaac* had *; and his *Infants* the same *precious privileges*, as *Isaacs infants* had *, who though they were by *nature* the *Children* of *wrath*, yet by *grace* they were the *Children* of *God*, in his *Covenant* *, and in his *Church* *; *Children* of the *promise*, counted for the *seed* *, and *called* by his name.

Whereas you say, because *there may be infants in the household, that thence they conclude, that infants may be baptized.*

Ians. I never did heare any so conclude, from this bare *argument* (or *may be*) which you have here specified.

But to this *argument* you make answer, *that there might be no infants there.*

To which I reply, that there might be *infants* there; for who should controle (or forbid) the *parents* from keeping their owne *Children*, as well in *infancie*, as after?

Whereas you say, your *Negative is as good as their Affirmative*; What affirmative doe you mean? and who are the persons you here intend? If you meane the bare *conclusion* from *infants* being *in the household*, that therefore *infants may be baptized*; I think such an *Affirmative* is somewhat like your *Negative*, though it be not the same; but peradventure those [*some others*] you mention besides *Seperates*, were the authors hereof.

But to make your *Negative as good* [*and more probable*] then *their Affirmative*, which you say is *without any proofe*, you adde these words, *For it is said*, Act. 18. 8. *That Crispus the chiefe Ruler of the Synagogue, beleeved on the Lord, with all his household, and that many of the Corinthians hearing it, beleeved and were baptized.* And it is said of the *Gaoler*, who was baptized and all his, *Act.* 16. 32. *That Paul and Sylas first preached the Word unto him, and to all that were in his house.* And in the 33. verse, it is said, *that he with all his household beleeved in God. So then* (say you) *it is plaine, that they first beleeved, and then were baptized*; *and although it be barely spoken of Paul's baptizing the household of Stephanus*, 1 Cor. 1. 16. *And of the baptizing of Lydia and her household*, Act. 16. 15. *yet it cannot reasonably be imagined, but that he did baptize these according to the Commission, and as he did baptize the Gaoler and his house, which was first preaching to them, and bringing him and all his house to the faith, as is evident by the Text*;

* Luk. 19, 9, 1
* Rom. 4. 2
* Gal. 3. 7.
* Gen. 17.
Isa 56.
* Isa. 22.
Psal. 112. 1, 2
* Gen. 17. 7.
* Exod. 12 4
* Rom. 9. 8.
Gen. 21. 12.

and thoſe other places which are more ſilent, muſt be expounded and underſtood by this which is more plaine, and not this by thoſe.

To which I anſwer, that all this which you have here rehearſed, doth not prove the thing for which you brought it (to wit) that your *Negative is as good and more probable then their Affirmative*; I pray you, tell me, Doth any of theſe Scriptures tell you that *there was no* Infants *in theſe* families? or that (according to your former Concluſion) it is more probable, *there was none, then that there was any?* Surely ſuch a thing cannot be gathered from any tittle of *Scripture*, or neceſſary conſequence therefrom; neither doe theſe *Scriptures*, alledged by you, nor your following Concluſion from thence, which you have here ſet downe, contradict the *Baptiſme* of *Infants* in the leaſt, wherfore it will not ſerve your turne, to vindicate what you have ſaid before in oppoſition of the truth.

That which we ought ſeriouſly to minde, is that the *infants* of *beleeving parents*, are *bleſſed* with their *faithfull parents* *. *Their iniquities are forgiven, and their ſinnes are covered* *, *and the Lord imputeth righteouſnes unto them* [*without workes* *] (as hath been proved before *.) Wherefore wee may ſafely conclude, that all thoſe *infants* which were then in theſe *families*, or any other (if they were the *infants* of one or both *beleeving parents*) the *application* of the *Goſpel* belonged unto them, and therefore the *Apoſtles* in *preaching life* and *ſalvation* (and applying the *promiſes*) unto the *parents*, did alſo apply the *promiſes* unto their *infants*, according to the practiſe of *God* himſelfe, who did not viſibly *ſeperate* between the *beleeving parents* and their *infants*, but graciouſly accepted of them in his *Covenant*; And when he preached the *Goſpel* to the *parents*, never did *exclude*, but ever did *include* their *infants* with them. And to the intent that all *beleeving parents* might be incouraged to truſt in him and relie upon him for the accompliſhment of his gracious *promiſes*, which he made unto them and their *Infants*. The *holy* and *bleſſed God* repeated the ſame divers times, yea, and ſundry times, at one and the ſame inſtant; as in *Gen.* 17. *I will* (ſayth God to *Abraham*) make my Covenant *between* me and thee, and thou ſhalt be a father of a multitude of Nations, &c*. *And I will* eſtabliſh *my* Covenant *between* me and thee, and thy ſeed after thee in their generations, for an everlaſting Covenant. To be a God *unto* thee, *and to* thy ſeed after thee, and (againe he ſayth) *I will be their God.* Note here how *often* in this *one place* and at this *one time*, he repeat-

* Iſa. 65. 23.
* Pſal. 32. 1, 2.
* Rom. 4. 6.
See pag. 3. 4. 6
o pag. 14.
ee pag. 15, 16, 17.

Gen. 17. 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8.
e alſo ver. 19. 21.

eth his *Covenant*, hereby to take away all doubts and ſuſpicious obiections, (which might happen (through Sathans temptations) to ariſe in the hearts of any of his people, againſt the large extent and ſufficiency of the ſame *Covenant*.) he bindeth it up with weighty words, and ſentences of great conſequence; yea and for further confirmation of his peoples *faith* (in *beleeving* the firmeneſſe of his *promiſes*, and the largeneſſe of his *Covenant*) he annexed a *viſible ſigne and ſeale* thereof, to the intent that they might not forget his *Covenant*: And as *beleeving Gentiles* and their *infants* were taken into *Covenant* with *God* then, ſo they were to ſubmit unto his *ordinances*, amongſt which this ſame *Circumciſion* (the *ſigne* of his *Covenant* *, and *ſeale of the righteouſneſſe of faith* *) was one, which was given unto them to obſerve throughout their *generations*: for this ſee *Gen.* 17. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. And in *Exod.* 12. 48 49. The *Lord* there declareth unto his people *Iſrael*, ſaying; *And when a ſtranger ſhall ſojourne with thee, and will keep the Paſſeover to the Lord, let all his males be circumciſed, and then let him come neer and keep it, and he ſhall be as one that is borne in the Land; for no uncircumciſed perſon ſhall eat thereof. One law ſhall be to him that is home-borne, and unto the ſtranger that ſojourneth among you.* By this wee may ſee, that the *Proſelytes* and their ſeed, had *equall precious priviledges* with the *Jewes*, and their ſeed. And ſo the *Jewes infants* and the *infants* of *beleeving Gentiles* then were not as thoſe who were without God in the world, but were *joynt-heires* of the *ſame precious promiſes*, they had *viſible right*, by vertue of the Covenant, to all the *ordinances* of *God*, then preſent, or [illegible] to come, and were to be partakers thereof, as they had capabilitie to receive the ſame, even according to the requiring of the *Scripture*. There is much then to be conſidered in this, that the *infants* of *beleevers* were admitted to be *members* of the *viſible Church* (and to receive the *ſigne* and *ſeale* of the *righteouſneſſe* of *faith*, together with other priviledges) before *Chriſt* was manifeſted in the fleſh; for *Jeſus Chriſt* came not to take any *priviledges* from them, but gave them as great (if not greater) in ſtead thereof. Let us not thinke that he came into the *world* to take from them the *types*, and to bereave them both of *ſubſtances* and *types*; But rather let us conclude, that for as much as the *Sonne* of *God* (whoſe delight was with the *ſonnes of men* *, before he was made the *ſonne* of *man*) is *wiſdome* and *truth* it ſelfe, he came not to deceive the leaſt *members* of his *beloved Spouſe*, of the leaſt *happi-*

* Gen. 17. 11
* Rom. 4, 11

* Prov. 8. 31

nes

nes or *bleſſednesſe*, which they formerly by right received and enjoyed from him. Now it was a *bleſſednesſe* unto Gods people for the *Lord* to give unto them *outward visible ſignes*, for the confirmation of their faith. But *Circumciſion* of *Infants*, was an outward visible *ſigne* given unto his people from God, for the confirmation of their faith *: Therefore it was a bleſſednesſe unto them to enjoy it, amongſt other bleſſings, and bleſſed priviledges.

* Gen 17. 11. Rom. 4. 11.

It being then a *bleſſednes* for the *infants* of *beleevers* to be admitted *members* of *Gods viſible Church*, and ſo to have (by vertue of his Covenant) a viſible right to all *Gods ordinances*, and to partake of them, according as they were capable (I mean in reſpect of a naturall capabilitie) if the ſame *priviledges* are not granted (by *God*) to the *generation* of the *faithfull* now, it ſeemeth that *God* unloadeth his *people* of the *bleſſings* which he hath formerly beſtowed upon them, which to affirme is contrary to the Scripture, *Pſal.* 68. 19. where *David* ſpeaking of the *gifts* which *Chriſt* ſhould give unto the *Rebellious*, ſayth, *Bleſſed be the Lord, who daily loadeth us with bleſſings, even the God of our ſalvation, Selah.* Seeing then that it was ſuch a *bleſſednesſe* for the *beleeving parents*, to have their *infants* in *Gods Covenant* with themſelves, and to receive the *ſigne* thereof, for confirmation of their *faith*, and ſeeing that *God daily loadeth his people with bleſſings*, then ſurely it cannot reaſonably be imagined that *God* hath *unloaded* his people of theſe excellent *bleſſings*, for as much as he is alwayes one and the ſame. Seeing then that beleeving *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, and their *infants* joyntly had this *bleſſednes*, they have the ſame *bleſſednes* now; their *priviledges* are not leſſened by the comming of *Chriſt*; for he came not for any ſuch intent and purpoſe, but he came to confirm the promiſes made with the fathers: therefore was *Jeſus Chriſt* a Miniſter of the *Circumciſion* for the truth of *God*, and ſo to confirme the promiſes made with the fathers *, by fulfilling them; *So all the promiſes in him are yea and Amen.* And this was done alſo, that *the Gentiles might glorifie God for his mercy*; as it is written, *For this cauſe I will confeſſe to thee among the Gentiles, and ſing unto thy Name.* And again he ſayth, *Rejoyce yee Gentiles with his people.* And againe; *Praiſe Jehovah all yee Gentiles. Laud him all yee people; for his mercy is mightie towards us, and the faithfulneſſe of Jehovah endureth for ever*, Pſal. 117. And againe *Eſayas* ſayth, *There ſhall be a root of Jeſſe, and he that ſhall riſe to reigne over the Gentiles, and in him ſhall the Gentiles truſt.* And *David* ſaith

* Rom. 15. 8, 9, 10, 11. 12.

in

in *Pſal.* 22. 28, 29. 31. *All the ends of the earth ſhall remember, and turne to Jehovah, and all families of the Heathens ſhall do worſhip before thee; for to Jehovah pertaines the kingdome; and he is Ruler among the Nations, &c. A ſeed ſhall ſerve him, it ſhall be accounted to the Lord for a generation.* Obſerve how the Scriptures here doe ſet forth the excellent benefits which appertain to all the *Saints* in generall, and to the *holy families* in particular, under the flouriſhing time of the *Goſpel*. Here is great occaſion for the *Saints* to *glorifie*, to *magnifie*, to *confeſſe*, to *praiſe*, and to *laud* the great *God* of heaven and earth, who hath ſo far magnified his *word*, ſo ſtrongly confirmed his promiſes made unto the fathers, and hath ſo largely extended his *Goſpel-privileges* unto them, and to their *ſeed*: *Their ſeed are in the bleſſing*; *It ſhall* (ſayth *David*) *be accounted unto the Lord for a generation.* Weigh theſe ſentences, and compare the ſame with *Gen.* 17.10. where the *Lord* ſayd unto *Abraham*, *Thou ſhalt keepe my Covenant, thou and thy ſeed after thee in their generations.* And ſo it is ſayd here in *Pſal.* 22. that *a ſeed ſhall ſerve him.* Now to ſerve him indeed, is to keep his Covenant, and thoſe that keep his *Covenant*, are obedient to his *lawes* and *ordinances*, which he preſcribeth; Now as *Abraham* and his *ſeed* then were accounted of before the Lord, ſo are the *beleeving Gentiles* and their *ſeed*; they are counted before the *Lord* for a *generation*: for time was when they were not accounted before the *Lord* for a *generation*, no reckoning was made of the *Nations*, they were *without Chriſt, being aliens from the Common-wealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the Covenants of promiſe, having no hope, and without God in the world*; (miſtake me not, I doe not ſay, that *the beleeving Gentiles* (or *Proſelytes*) or their *infants* were without *Chriſt*, or without *God* in the *world*, when God took them in his *Covenant*, be it far from me ſo to thinke; for theſe *viſible Saints* were no further off then the *beleeving Jewes* ✶;) But the Apoſtle declareth that ſuch aliens as were then *without God in the world*; Now *God* of his *rich mercy* hath called them unto him by *repentance*; and now God calling them his *people*, who were not his *people*, and making them of *Lyons*, *Lambs*, bringing them into ſubjection to his *lawes*, and to the *obedience* of his *faith*, they are *holy* and *ſpirituall*, and accounted as precious as *Abraham* and his *infants* were; for theſe *Gentiles*, who *ſometimes were far off, are made nigh by the bloud of Chriſt*; And he hath accepted of them joyntly into his ſervice, giving them the *bleſſing of Abraham*[a] and his *poſteritie*,

Eph. 2. 11, 12.

✶ See *Gen.* 17. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14. *Exod.* 12. 48.

1 Cor. 7. 14.

Eph. 2. 13, 14.

a *Gen.* 12. 3. *Gal.* 3. 8. 14.

b Pſal. 22. 30.
a Cor. 7. 14.
1 Pet. 2. 9.
Rev. 1. 6.
Iſa. 19. 18. &c.

c Rom. 10. 12.
Rev. 22. 14.

d Gal. 3. 28.
e Ver. 29.
Luk. 19.
f Gal. 3. 29.
g Eph 3. 6.
h Gal 4 28.
i Gal. 3. 9.
k Rom. 11. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24
l Eph. 1. 3.

m Gen. 17. 11, 12, 13.
Exod. 12. 48.

n Col. 2. 11, 12

o Act. 16. 15.
p 1 Cor 1 16. 33
q Gen. 17. 23. 9 10. 12.
r 30. 25. 30.
s 45. 10. 11. 18, 19.
t 46. 5, 6, 7.
Exod. 1. 1.
Num. 3. 15. 39
Pſal. 115. 12, 13, 14.
Luk. 19. 9.
Prov 31. 15.
1 Tim. 5. 8.

ſteritie, accounting of them before him, as a *holy generation*[b]; Whereas before they were viſibly of no account, of no eſtimation in the ſight of God, or his people. But God of his rich mercy made them rich, yea (in generall) equally rich with the *Jewes* in reſpect both of externall and internall precious priviledges. *The ſame God over all*, (ſayth the Apoſtle) *is rich unto all that call upon him*[c]; their *riches* are not leſſened (or diminiſhed) one jot, they are equallized with the *riches* of the *Jewes*; let them be *bond or free, male or female, they are all one in Chriſt*[d], *Abrahams ſeed*; like *Zacheus*[e], *and heires according to promiſe*[f], *fellow-heires, and of the ſame body, and partakers of his promiſe by the Goſpel*[g]: The children of the *promiſe* as *Iſaac* was[h], *Bleſſed* with their *faithfull* father *Abraham*[i]: *grafted* into the ſame ſtocke, and *olive tree* and *root*, from whence the *unbeleeving Jewes* for unbeliefe *were cut off*[k]; and theſe *beleevers* the Apoſtle concludeth are *bleſſed by God the Father with all ſpirituall bleſſings in heavenly places in Chriſt*[l]; and therefore I ſee no reaſon why the *beleeving parents* now (though *Gentiles*) ſhould not have the like precious priviledges for their *ſeed* in infancie as their brethren and Countrimen had in former time for their *ſeed*[m] *in infancie*; Yea, conſidering that the *infants* of *beleevers* now are able to doe, as good, great, faithfull, and acceptable ſervice, as the *infants* of *beleevers* in the time of the *Law*; and that theſe are as capable of *Baptiſme* [this *paſſive Ordinance*,] as thoſe were of *Circumciſion* [that *paſſive Ordinance*,] which was no more paſſive then this, and was the forerunner of this; and both *that* and *this* being in one generall inſtitution, and one and the ſame in effect[n]; we may ſafely *beleeve* and juſtly conclude, that the Saints *infants* ought to be *baptized*; as formerly they were *Circumciſed*; yea, and for as much as the *Apoſtles* themſelves (ſpeaking generally of *baptizing* whole *houſholds*[o];) never once make mention of the exempting of any of their *infants*; (though it be a matter of ſo great concernment,) how then ſhall we reject them? And conſidering that in the Scripture, by the ſpeech of an *houſe, familie*, or *houſhold*, *infants* are alſo implyed therein[p], (and ſeeing *Baptiſme* is come in the roome of *Circumciſion*.) If *infants* ſhould not have been *baptized*, as formerly they were *circumciſed*, ſure the *Apoſtles*, in ſpeaking generally of *baptizing houſholds*, would not (without exception of *infants*) have uſed ſuch tearmes as are ſet downe in the *old* and *new Teſtament*, to include *infants*. Conſidering that then the *Apoſtles* had

had a just occasion to exclude their *infants* in expresse words, if any such thing should have been done. If holy *infants* should have been thrust out from being *members* of the *visible Church*, and from having their *spirituall priviledges*, as they have had heretofore; Surely, we should have found some tittle of it in the *New Testament*; but there is not the least shew of it, from whence wee may draw any just consequence, for dismissing them from being *members* of the *visible Church* of *Christ* *, and having their spirituall priviledges, as they have had heretofore.

Consider throughly, the words of *Peter*, how at the very preaching the *Gospel* of *Repentance* to the *parents*, in the application thereof, he did not barre out, but expresly mentioneth their *children*; and if wee doe but seriously weigh the *Text*, and compare it with other places of Scripture, which set forth the *blessednes* of the *children* with the *parents*, we may well conceive that it is meant of holy *infants* (as hath been formerly observed:) And as I plead for none to be *baptized* before they doe *beleeve*, so I plead for none to have the *Gospel* applyed unto them, before they have *faith* by *imputation*, and that is to be judged by some *visible rule* our of *Gods Word*. But, the *infants* of *beleevers* have faith by imputatiō (as is proved before) therefore (in this consideration) they are *beleevers*, *holy*, *and spirituall* [a]; and therefore the Gospel may be lawfully applyed unto them [b]; *and what letteth water, that these may not be baptized, which have received the holy Spirit as well as wee* [c]. As for *actuall profession*, or *verball demonstration* of *faith*, *God* hath not required the *children* of *beleevers* to performe in their owne persons, in the time of their *infancie*; which thing though they are not able to doe, yet they are in the *faith* of *Christ*, and shall certainly be *saved*, though they die in their *infancie*; for *God* will be no more wanting unto them, then to their *parents* [d].

It is to be minded, that *God* (*baptizing* [e] many *families* [f]) did not exempt such *children* from the *parents*, but *baptized* those persons that passed through the *Sea*, both men, women, and children, young and old. And so in the middest of their afflictions, by this *Oracle*, gave these *faithfull* [g] *persons* a *glimpse* of that which should be in the *dayes* of the *Messias*, where one *element*, and *passive ordinance*, should be *generall* for all his *precious Saints*, both *young* and *old*. So the *Apostles baptizing* many *families*, did not omit their *infants*; neither can wee finde in all the *New Testament*, that ever the

* Mr. *Spilsbery* saith *it is a truth that the* Church of the New Testament *confisteth both of* Jewes *and* Gentiles, *and admits of all that beleeve, and rejects none. And for the Gentiles* Infants *being in the* same body *as well as the* Jews *infants, this* (saith he) *I beleeve both alike.* For this see his treatise of bapt. p. 11.

a 1 Cor. 7. 14.

b Mat. 10, 13, 16. Mar. 10, 13, 14, 15 Luk. 18. 15, 16, 17

See Luk. 1. 76.

c Acts 10. 47.

d Isa. 22. 24. Heb. 11. 8.

e 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2

f Ex. 12, 21. 37. 41. Ps. 77. 17, 19, 20

g Heb. 11. 29.

infants

infants of the faithfull are exempted, in *expresse words*, nor can it be gathered by *necessary consequence*. The *Apostle Peter* maketh the *Baptisme* in the *Arke* equivolent with our *Baptisme* now [1]; And *Paul* declared that he would not have the *beleeving Corinthians* ignorant [2], that *God baptized* his *Church* then, which consisted of many *families*, in which there were many *infants*, who were the approoved subjects of *Circumcision* [3], and of that *Baptisme* then; And therefore *Baptisme* now, being a [*generall*] *ordinance*, [yea and alwayes [*more generall*] in the administration, then *Circumcision* ever was] yea, and it being given to all the visible members of *Christs* body [4], (amongst whom the *infants* of *beleeving parents* are no small number [5],) they ought to be *baptized*, both *male*, and *female*, thereby to set forth the *excellent benefits* which they have by *Christ*.

1 Pet. 3. 20, 21.
2 1 Cor. 10, 1, 2.
3 Exod. 12. 48. Jos. 5. 2, 5, 7. Mat. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 16.
4 Zech. 8. 5. Luke 18. 15, 16, 17. Isa. 22. 24.
5 *A. R.* Pag. 3. l. 39. & pag. 4. l. 3.

A *Third* [*argument*] *of theirs* (say you) *is from* 1 Cor. 7. 14. where it is said, *Else were your Children uncleane, but now are they holy*: Whence (you say) they thus reason; *If the Children of beleeving parents be holy*; (that is to say, *in the new Covenant*) *then they may have the seales of the Covenant, and be baptized*. To which I adde this argument, both for explanation, and confirmation of the former.

All those persons whom wee ought to judge to have the *invisible Seale* (even *the holy Spirit of promise*, Eph. 1. 13.) ought to be esteemed *spiritually holy*, and in the *new Covenant*, and ought to be *baptized*, Act. 10. 47. But the *infants* of (one or both) *beleeving parents*, ought to be esteemed to have the *invisible Seale*, even the *holy Spirit of promise* [1], 1 Cor. 7. 13, 14. Therefore the *infants* of (one or both) *beleeving parents*, ought to be judged *spiritually holy*, and in the *new Covenant*, and ought to be *baptized*.

Act. 10. 47. Rom. 28. 18, 19. Gal. 26. 15, 16. 1 Cor. 7. 13, 14. Exod. 12. 48. Luke 18. 15, 16, 17. John. 3. 5.
1 *A. R.* Pag. 4. l. 22, 23. Pag. 4. l. 3, 4, 5. & l. 13.

Your Reasons that they are not in the *new Covenant*, are

First, *Because there is now but one Covenant on foot, which is a covenant of grace and salvation.*

Secondly, *Because there is but one manner of entering and being in this Covenant.*

Thirdly, *That there is but one holinesse now acceptable with God, which is inward, spirituall, &c.*

To which I answer, that the like you may say of the *members* of the *visible Church*, which doe *actually* and *verbally professe faith*. As if you should say thus unto them; *There is but one new Covenant*

now

now on foot, therefore you (beleevers) are not in it.

This reason is three-bare.

Secondly, *There is but one manner of entering and being in that Covenant, therefore you are not of that Covenant!* This is as poor as the other.

Thirdly, *Because there is no holinesse accepted with God, but that which is inward, spirituall, and in truth &c.* Therefore you beleevers are not in the *new Covenant*, nor ought to be *baptized*! Is not this mad kind of reasoning? But to performe that which you promised, your should have proved, that *the infants of beleevers* are not *spiritually holy*, nor never did, or can enter in the *new covenant*, and then I would have said, you had done somewhat like to that you tooke upon you to doe. but instead of taking away the *position*, that *infants* are *holy* and in the *new covenant*, you tell us, that *there is but one covenant; the manner of entering into it and abiding in it but one; the holinesse a new acceptable with God to be but one*; To which I further answer, that though a person be not holy [internally,] nor under the *new covenant* [in Gods secret acount] yet [in our acount] he is to be esteemed to be in the *new covenant*. An *hypocrite* may make a glorious shew, yea and seeme in *outward acts of obedience* to goe further then a true *Saint*, *He may give his goods to the poore and his body to be burned, and yet want love*. 1 Cor. 13.

Ob. But peradventure you will aske how then we must judge of an *hypocrite?*

An. Surely, as the faithfull *Disciples* of Christ judged of *Judas*; *Judas* had, a *Saint-ship*, an *Apostle-ship*, and a *Deacon-ship***, *Symon Magus* also had an [outward] *Saint-ship** upon him; An *hypocrite* (or *saint outwardly*) (I say) must be judged to be as a [*true*] *Saint* is, till he be discovered to us; for though *God* know the *heart*, yet wee doe not, though he see invisibly, we cannot; We must judge of *invisible things*, by *visible demonstrations*. Some men may creep in, and make a [faire] shew outwardly for a while, yea and a great while, and yet be hypocrites, but tell they are discovered to be evill, what man can poynt them out, and say from his own knowledge that they are not under the *new covenant*.

** Mat. 10. 1,2,4,16. Mark. 3. 14. & 6.7,12,13 Luke 9. 1. 10 Iohn. 12.45 & 13.29. * Act. 8.12,13

A perso that offers to joyn himself to a *particular Church of Christ*, and [not only by his *verball confession*, but by his *life* and *conversation*] apeareth unto them to be an *out-side Christian*, (they knowing

nothing by him but *good*) if they refuse him, it is their *sinne*; though all which he doth (outwardly) is *fained*.

A humane *creature* though he have the *wisdom* & *knowledg* of *Angels*, yet can he not know what is in *man*, none (I say) knoweth this but only the *man Christ*; wherefore it is apparent that though none are by us to be esteemed *spiritually holy* but those that are outwardly in the same *new covenant* in which the visible *Church* is; yet all the members therein ought so to be esteemed, till they are seen to degenerate.

And moreover, I would have you to know, that *God* doth not only accept of our *inward performances*, but of our very *words*, yea of all *externall holy performances*, in his *worship* and *service*, if they be done according to his will; so *David* saith, *Let the* [*words of my mouth*] *and the meditations of my heart, be acceptable in thy sight**; So that though all our *worship* and *service* unto *God*, ought to be *spirituall*, and done in *spirit*, and in *truth*, yet, God hath not bound us to doe it only *internally*, and not *externally* also; yea, for as much as he hath made us *bodies*, as well as *soules* and *spirits*, therefore he doth require *outward performances* of us, as well as *inward* *, but when his *saints* are not capable; *God* then doth accept of them neverthelesse, and imputeth *Christ righteousnesse* unto them notwithstanding their naturall weaknesse; Let them (while they are capable) keep themselves unspotted, and doe that which *God* requireth, and then (when they are no more capable to know or do any *spirituall* action) they are still not only knowne of *God*, but beloved of *Christ*, and sanctified by the *holy Sprit*; for though they cannot apprehend *Gods* working in them, yet *God* can tell how he worketh in them, and saveth them [by the imputation of *Christs righteousnesse**;] And after this manner doth *God* worke in the *Infants* of *beleevers*: So long as they are not capable, he doth not require them to act but to suffer, as *holy infants* in former time suffered, not only the administration of his *passive ordinance** of *circumcision*, but also *death** it selfe (for his sake) from the hands of *Gods* enimies.

But your inference from your foregoing reasons is; *That if beleevers childeren be in the covenant, and have this true holinesse, then all the childeren of beleeving parents must be saved, as well old childeren as young, for age doth not make them cease from being their childeren. But all the childeren of beleevers are not saved, no not of faithfull Abraham.*

* Psal. 19. 14.

Holinesse both inward and outward is accepted of God:

* Mat. 28. 20. Rev. 1. 3. 11. Zach. 14. 16, 17, 18, 19. Luke 22. 19, 20

* Cor. 5. 3. & 6. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 10. & 16. 1. 2. Act. 1. 26. & 2. 42. Jam 2. 18. Ps. 3. 2. Rom. 4. 6.

* Gen. 17. 14, 23 Jos 5. 3. 7. 8. Ex. 1. 22. Act. 7. 19. Sam. 22. 19.

A. R.

Pag. 4. l. 13. to 24.

ham himſelfe, according to that known ſentence of the Prophet Iſaiah, 10. 21. Repeated by Saint Paul Romans. 9. 27. Though the number of the childeren of Iſrael be as the ſand of the ſea, yet but a remnant of them ſhall be ſaved: Therefore the childeren of beleevers are not in the covenant now on foot, nor aught to be baptized.

To which I *Anſ.* That *beleevers childeren* are in the *covenant*, is true; but that [all] the *childeren* of [all] *beleevers* are in the *covenant*, is not true, but all their holy *infants* are, and ought ſo to be judged, & accounted euen in the ſtate of *ſalvation*, as wel as the greateſt verball profeſſors of the *faith* of *Chriſt*, and all theſe *infants* of *beleeving parents* that live till they come to yeares of diſcretion, are ſtill to be acounted *holy* and *ſpirituall*, except they *apoſtate*.

Now though the Scripture declareth that a *remnant* ſhall be ſaved, yet we are directed, by the rule of Gods Word, to judge, that beleeving parents, and their ſeed that doe not degenerate, are of this remnant. But the childeren of beleevers in their infancie have not power actually to degenerate from the righteous ſteps of their holy parents. But *ould childeren* may poſſibly. So *Iſhmael* [when he was an *infant*] was not a mocker neither was *Cain* [in his infancie] a murtherer: but when they came to yeares, and acted theſe wickednesſes, they were for the ſame caſt out, the one from communion with the familie of *Adam**; the other from the familie of *Abraham***.

**Gen.* 4. 11. 14. 16.

***Gen.* 21. 9. 10.

And as you reaſon here againſt *beleevers infants* being in the new Covenant, becauſe you know not abſolutely whether they ſhall be ſaved. So you may reaſon againſt the *parents* themſelves, though they are *members* of the *viſible Church*, and alſo as well plead againſt every verball profeſſor, that is, a viſible *member* of the ſame body.

Thus, *All you which ſeem to be beleevers, are a people which have indeed taken upon you the profeſſion of the great name of God, and have given up your ſelves unto him, to walke in all his wayes,* and ſay, *you have taken hold of Gods Covenant, and have couenanted together to become an entire body, City, Houſe, Temple, Garden, Vineyard, &c. unto God, whom you ſuppoſe to be your builder and planter, &c. So you thinke your ſelves to be his holy people, his bride by marriage, his peculiar treaſure, in covenant with him, &c. But alas! you are much deceived, you thinke your ſelves to be in a holy and happie eſtate, in Covenant with God, and that you have right to his Ordinances, but it is not ſo.* For, then it

it will follow, *That if you believers* [*members of this visible Church*] *be in the Covenant, and have this true holinesse, then every member of you must be saved as well old as young, &c. But all the members of the visible Church are not saved* [*no, not of the Christian Church in the Apostles time, for divers of them perished, as* Judas Iscarot, [*one of the Lambs 12 Apostles*] *and Simon Magus*: Therfore, though you profess faith, you are not in the Covenant now on foot, nor ought to be baptised.

If this be a good and sufficient ground, or reason, to prove the parents not to be in the new Covenant, not to be baptized, then the same reason is of force, against the *infants* of believers, to prove them also not to be in the new *Covenant*, nor to be *baptized*. But this is very weak, against such *parents*, Therefore it is of no force, against their *infants*.

Seeing it is so, you may plainly perceive that I have just ground to except against your conclusio, that because all the children of believers are not saved, Therefore the infants of believers are not in the Covenant now on foot, nor ought to be baptized. Pag. 4. l. 22, 23

Such an excuse as this might as well have served in former time for the *children* of *Israel*, that they might not only have neglected *Circumcision*, but also, all other *Ordinances*: But such arguing bringeth *large liberty* tending to *Athisme*, *destruction*, and ruination of the *foundation* of *Christian Religion*.

But what saith *Paul*, (when he declareth that *the Jewes had the Oracles of God committed unto them*) *what if some did not believe, shall their unbelisefe make the faith of God of none effect, God forbid, yea, let God be true, and every man a lyar, &c.* Rom. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4.

The *Apostasie* of *Cain*, could not hurt *Adam*, nor hinder *Abel* from *eternall life*. For though *Cain* and his seed perished, yet *God* was still good unto his *Church*, unto *Israel*, to those that were of an upright heart.

Furthermore, for to maintain errour, you bring errour, false things, to prove a falshood, (like two false witnesses that stand one for another,) for, to prove your own false affirmation, *that infants are not in the Covenant* outwardly, nor have that *holinesse* whereby *to be admitted now to the outward ordinance of baptisme, as infants were then to Circumcision in the time of the Law, and state of the Jews*.

You say, *That the state or Church of the Jews, were under the old Covenant and Law, and stood not by faith and circumcision of the heart, (as this Church of the Gospel doth) but stood meerly upon nature and circumcision* Pag. 4. l. 29.

circumcision of the flesh, and accordingly had their outward and sidereall holinesse, and outward cleansings, all which are abolished with that state, and no such holinesse or distinction is now between any persons in the world, all (you say) shall be further declared by and by.

To which I answer, *That the Church of the Jews were in the old Covenant and Law*, is true, But *that they stood not by faith and circumcision of the heart, as this Church of the Gospel doth, but stood meerly upon nature and circumcision of the flesh*, is not true, for the *Church* of the *Jewes* had the new covenant * *that was confirmed* to *Abraham* * *before, of God in Christ*, which covenant *the Law which was foure hundred and thirty yeares after could not disannull, that it should make the promise of none effect* *.

The *Jewes* were *Gods holy speciall* [a] *and peculiar* [b] *people*, who were not constituted of a *visible mixt multitude of* (*prophane* persons, and *holy beleevers* and *Infidels*,) *good and bad together* [c], but were a people *called* [d], and *separated* [e] from other Nations, *God* brought them out of *Egypt* [f], and *baptized* them in the *cloud*, and in the *sea* [g] and went before them, *by day in a pillar of cloud, and by night in a pillar of fire* [h], and at the great and victorious deliverance which they had over the *Egyptians*, *they beleeved his Words, and sang his praise* [i], then God led them through the *wildernesse* [k], and made the *bitter waters sweet* for them [l], that they might trust in him who healed them [m]; and *he fed them with Manna, which neither they nor their fathers knew*, to the intent that they might know [n], that *man could not live by bread only, but by every word of God* [o], and he made *the flinty rock a fountain of waters* [p], that they thereby might quench their thirst: Yea, *The Lord came from mount Synay, and rose up from Seir*, unto them, *he shined forth from mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of his Saints, from his right hand went a fiery Law, yea, he loved the people* [r], they were therefore to trust stedfastly in *God*, *the sword of their excellencie* [s], and to look continually for *eternall life* of him, and cleave unto him [t] who was their *life and the length of their dayes* [u], whom they were commanded to fear and to love, and to serve, with all their *heart*, and with all their *soule* [w], *so the Lord was with them, & they with him*, and as he had commanded them, so they were still to be *a holy people* to the *Lord* their *God*, even as he was holy [x].

By all which it appeares that there was a manifest difference put between them and the prophane of the world, as is between *Christ* and *Antichrist*.

In

*Mr. Gillebery granteth the Covenant made with Abraham, and the Covenant now to be the same in substance. See his treatise, pag. 8 line. 10.

* Gen. 17. *Gal.* 3. 16, 17.

[a] Deut. 7. 6. [b] & 26. 18. 19. [c] & 29. 18. & 32. 9. 12. Esay. 5. 1, 2. [d] & 41. 1, 2. & 45. 1. 7. Mat. 22. 3. [e] Ps. 135. 4. & 148. 14. & 125. 2. Deut. 33. 29. & 14. 2. [f] Ex. 12. 41. [g] 1 Cor. 10. 1. [h] Ex. 13. 21. [i] Ex. 15. 1. Ps. 106. 12. [k] Ex. 15. 22. [l] ver. 25. [m] v. 26. [n] Deut. 8. 3. [o] Ps. 114. 8. Num. 20. 8. [p] Deut 33. 2. [q] ver. 29. [r] & 10. 20. [s] & 32. 29, 30. [t] Deut. 10. 20. [u] Levit. 18. 4. & 19. 2. & 20. 7.

In brief, as their *Church* was the *Church* of *Christ* [a] and the *Covenant* [b] which they had [c] the Covenant of *Christ*, so the *Commandement* [d] (or word) which was not hid from them was the *Gospel*, (which they were not to enquire after, as though it were some strange thing *afar off*, or beyond the seas, &c. for it was *nigh* unto them, in their *mouth* and in their *heart*, that they might doe it) even the *Gospel* of *Christ*, the same *word* of *faith* which *Paul* preached; yea, further they had not onely the *Gospel* of *Christ*, but *Christ* himselfe, his presence, in a speciall manner amongst them, though he were not then manifested in the flesh.

Wherefore I would have you to consider, and revoke those rash speeches, that this *heavenly society and blessed fraternity, stood not by faith but meerly upon nature and circumcision of the flesh.*

It is an infidelious opinion to judge them to be *Infidels* (in the *Jewes state*) whom *God* did *so call* and *separate*, which had his *Oracles* and *Ordinances*, whom he *called* his *holy people*, his *chosen* [e] and *peculiar people* [f], his *beloved ones* [g], to whose *seed* he promised *life* as to themselves [h] whose hearts he promised to *circumcise*, as also the hearts of their *seed* [i] (*as he hath promised to his people in the last dayes*;) which thing, *circumcision* of the *flesh* was to teach them, it being the *signe* [k] and *seal* [l] of the *righteousnesse* of *faith*, as *baptisme* is now. And this you may minde also, that though the *rebellious seed* of *Abraham* (according to the flesh) were *rejected* [m], yet the *strangers* that *joyned* to the *Lord* were still received [n], wherefore this is a plain evidence, that they stood by the *grace* and *life* of *God* and *Christ*, and *circumcision* of the heart, for the cause why *God* rejected some of the circumcised *seed* of *Abraham* according to the *flesh*, was, because they were uncircumcised in heart [o], and therefore the *Lord* threatned to *visite* them (and did visit them) with the uncircumcised in flesh.

Wherefore it appeareth, that without *faith* and *circumcision of* the heart they could not stand at all.

And the Scripture saith, that *the unbeleeving Jewes were cut off for unbeliefe, and that those that stand doe stand by faith, and therefore are admonished not to be high minded but fear* [p], *and take heed* [q] *and continue in the beautifulnesse of* God [r], *and that the unbeleeving Jewes also if they abide not in unbeliefe, shall be grafted in again* [s].

Wherefore it appeareth, that as *unbeliefe* was the cause why the *unbeleeving Jewes* were cut off from the *olive tree*, whereon they were

[a] See *Cant.* Rev. 21. 3. Gal. 3. 16, 17. [b] Deut. 30. 11. [c] 12, 13, 14. Rom. 10. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10.

[d] Esay. 63. 9.

[e] Deut. 10. 15. [f] Cap. 14. 2. [g] Cap 7. 7. 8. [h] Cap. 30. 19. 20 [i] Deut 30. 6. [k] Gen. 17. 11. [l] Rom. 4 11. Col. 2. 11, 12. [m] Esay. 2. 6. 9 Esay 56. 4, 5, 6, 7, 8.

[n] Ier. 9. 25, 26.

[o] Rom. 11. 20. [p] v. 21. [q] v. 22. [r] v. 23.

were, so *unbeliefe* was the bar, which kept them off, *for if they abide not in unbeliefe, they shall be grafted in again*; and this proveth that their standing was never to be otherwise but by *faith* and *circumcision of the heart*.

Neither are we to thinke, that the giving of the *Law* at mount *Sinai*, or the *ceremonies* which the *Jewes* then had to lead them to *Christ*, or any of *Gods Oracles* being committed unto them, or any persons groundlesse departing from the *Sinai*, doth argue that the *constitution* of the same *Church* was, as you would have it taken to be; Neither did their *circumcision* of the *flesh* argue that they stood not by *faith*, and *circumcision* of the *heart*, no more then the outward *baptisme* doth now argue, that the *Saints* now, stand not by *faith*, and the *inward baptisme* of the *heart* and *spirit*, but *meerly upon nature and baptisme of the flesh*.

But you should know, that as it is not possible to please *God* now without faith *, no more was it then *. In the time of the Law, God abhorred his own Ordinances if they were not done in faith *.

* Heb. 11. 6.
* Psal. 50. 18.
* Isa. 1. 13, 14.

And as *faith* gave *Abraham* the denomination of Gods friend, (the *righteousnesse* of which faith, *Circumcision* was a *seal* *;) so none were ever esteemed as the *holy people*, the *sonnes* and *daughters* and *friends* of *God*, but those that were made nigh unto him by the *promise* of *Christ*, and by *faith*, and *circumcision of the heart*.

* Rom. 4. 11.

And you should know, that the *Jewes* had not outward *spirituall holinesse visibly* imputed unto them meerly because they were the *children* of *Abraham*, but because *Abraham their Father* and they his *children* were the *children* of *God*, and their *children's children* were in *Covenant*, and so they were the *children* of the *promise* as *Isaack was*, and blessed with their *Father Abraham*.

And this may further appeare unto you, because when any of the *seed* of *Abraham* (according to the *flesh*) did *degenerate*, their *rection* was not for (or because) that they were the *children* of *Abraham*; but because they had taken upon them *the image* of *Satan*, and so degenerated from the steps of *Abraham*, and thereby became the children of *Belial*.

And as we may say concerning these *Hebrews*, so we may say concerning the *Heathens*, when any of the *Gentiles*, (or *Heathens*) became *Prosolites*, their *children* that were at yeares of discretion were not to be *circumcised*, unlesse they were willing to enter into

 covenant

covenant with *God*, and to take upon them the *Lords yoke*, and fight under his *banner*; Howbeit, whether they were *circumcised* or not, they were still the *Prosolytes children*, according to the *flesh*.

But concerning the *infants* of the *Prosolytes*, there was no questioning of them, they were to be *circumcised* (being in the *covenant* with their *parents*,) and yet not *circumcised* because they were their *children* by *nature*, but because they were in the same *covenant* with their *holy parents*, and so they were the *children* of *God*, by his *free Grace*.

And the Scripture doth evidently declare that none were to be admitted into the *Church* of the *Jewes*, but *believing Hebrews*, and *Prosolytes*, and their *holy seed*. By all this it appeareth that the members of the *Jewes* state had a *spirituall belonge* with them, and stood no otherwise but by *faith*, and *circumcision* of the *heart*. And were not as those who were neither *believing Jewes*, but *Prosolytes*; *Aliens from the Common wealth of Israel, without hope, without God in the world, without Christ, and strangers from the covenants of promise. But the Church of the Jewes, (the Lords peculiar people) were made nigh unto God by the blood of Jesus Christ*, which was then to be *shed*, and is now shed for the *remission* of their *sins*, and their *reconciliation* to *God* the *father*, and his blessed *spirit*.

And whereas you say that the *state* or *Church* of the *Jewes* is *abollished*.

I tell you, I am not bound to believe that *God* abollished his *Church state* whereof *David*, *Solomon*, *Hezekias*, *Josias*, and the *holy Prophets* and *righteous* men were members, such a *Church* at the constitution whereof there was no prophane person, to be admitted, or any root bearing gall or worm wood to be suffered, but if you thinke that God changed the state in the dayes of the *Messias* his manifestation in the flesh, and made it more glorious, *Even as the Moone is said to be changed* [illegible] *but remaineth still the same Moone, though more glorious than before*, this I would rather believe than that.

And touching your speech of the abolishing of the other things. If you mean an abolishing of all the *baggarly* [illegible], taking away the *filiventist* [illegible] of some *ordinances*, and planting other materials in stead thereof, then I grant it; But be sure that you stick to this, that *Christ* came not to deceive the *Infants* of *believing parents*,

parents, to take away the substance of the *Ordinances*, but rather the *yeakes* which cleaved thereunto; which *circumstantiall things*, he nayled to his Crosse, in token that those who rightly and truely enjoyed them before, were now benefited without them, and were to have, through a *generall distribution*, an *equall proportionable share*, and *right*, to whatsoever came in stead thereof.

Now let us consider, that if the *infants* of *beleevers*, (members of the *Church* of the *Jews*) were not then *alien from the Common wealth of Israel*, nor *without hope*, nor *without God in the world*. They were not then *without Christ*, neither were they *Strangers from the Covenants of Promise*. * Eph. 2. 12.

But the Infants of beleevers (who were *members* of the *Church* of the *Jewes*,) were not *alien from the Common wealth of Israel*, nor *without hope*, nor *without God in the world*. * Gen. 17. 7. Deut. 29. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. 18.

Therefore such holy *Infants* were not then without *Christ*, neither were they *strangers* from the *covenants of promise*. Exod. 12. 48, 49.

Now for as much as the Infants *of* beleevers *were not without* Christ, nor *aliens from the Common wealth of Israel*, nor *strangers from the* Covenants *of* promise, *nor without hope*, nor *without God in the world*. They were such as were made *nigh by the blood of Christ*, whose blood was then to be shed, and is powred out for them; and therefore we may safely conclude, that the *holy Infants* are not loosers by his coming. And therefore [seeing the *New Covenant* is not abolished] it evidently appeareth that the *Infants* of *beleevers* now are in the *new Covenant*, because the *Infants* of *beleevers* were in the same *New Covenant* before. And this agreeth with the words of the Apostle *Paul*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. *Else were your children uncleane, but now are they holy*; for the *Apostle* there spruiteth to *beleevers*, and of a *holinesse* in relation to their *faith*, and to the *covenant* they were in. See Eph. 2. 13.

And though you said, *the old Covenant is abolished*, yet you grant that the *New Covenant* is not abolished but remaineth; Wherefore you must of necessitie be driven to grant also, that the *Infants* of *beleevers* are in the *new Covenant*, because they were of it before, and the *New covenant* remaineth permanent.

Thus having taken away the foundation of your *Arguments* which you brought (against *holy Infants* being in the *Covenant*) you may justly expect, that all which is builded upon the same *sandy foundation*, will fall to the ground.

Pag. 4. li. 37. Your next words are these which follow; *There being the new covenant now on foote, which is a covenant of grace and salvation, and which brings certaine salvation to all those that rightly enter into it, and which is onely by faith.* Hence it is said, *Act. 2. 47. That the Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.*

Ans. That the *new Covenant* is now on foot, and that it is the *covenant* of *grace*, and *salvation*, and brings it to all those which rightly enter into it in deed and in truth, is not by me denied. And that the enterance is onely by *faith*, is very true. But mind this, that there is an *externall* right, and an *internall* right. We [*finite creatures*] must judge of the *tree* by the *fruit* [a], of the *faith* by the workes [b]; *Judas* had no *internall right*, for he was a *devill inwardly*, yet he had an *externall right*, for he was a *Saint outwardly* [c]; But so long as he was not known to be a *wicked man*, but still made a great outward shew of *holinesse*, they were to judge him *righteous*; But when he manifested *evill fruits*, of *treachery* and *hypocrisie*, then they were to alter their former charitable opinion of him; And though he had (not onely an outward *Saintship*, but also) an *Apostle-ship*, and a *Deacon-ship* before; yet when he *Apostated*, that man who was before to be accounted a *Saint* and an *Angel* on earth, was afterward to be esteemed as a *devill*. And so the like may be said concerning other *wicked men*. *Set thou in office over him the wicked one* (saith holy *David* [d]) *and let the Adversary stand at his right hand, when he shall be judged, let him be condemned; and let his prayer become sinne. Let his dayes be few, and another take his office.* [Act. 1. 20.] *Let his children be fatherlesse, and his wife a widow. Let his children be continually vagabonds, and begge. Let them seeke their bread also out of their desolate places. Let the extortioner catch all that he hath; and let the stranger spoyle his labour. Let there be none to extend mercy unto him: neither let there be any to favour his fatherlesse-children. Let his posteritie be appointed to cutting off, & in the generation next after let his name be wiped out. Let the iniquitie of his* [fathers] *be remembred of Jehovah; and let not the sinne of his mother be wiped out. Let them be before Jehovah continually; that he may cut off the memorie of them from the earth, &c.*

a Mat. 12. 33. Luke 6. 44.
b Jam. 2. 18, 19
c Joh. 6. 70, 71
d Act. 1. 17.

Psal 41. 9, 10. Psal. 69. 25, 26, 27, 28. Psal. 109. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, [20.]

Now that *the Lord added to his Church daily such as should be saved*, is certaine; but here we are to note, that this *Church in Jerusalem*, was a *visible particular Church*. And that (as far as men could judge) all those were to be saved that in outward appearance were rightly added to the same, or to any other particular Church of

the same constitution. And *though the Lord added to his Church daily such as should be saved*; yet wee are not to determine that all that joyned to a particular *Church* were *saved*, yea though they were added rightly according to order, in an externall way. *Judas* was of the *visible Church*, yea of that *Church* whereof these were *members*, and yet wee will not say that he is *saved*. Persons may be *saved* which are of no *visible particular Church*; And persons may be of a true *visible particular Church* of Christ, and yet *Apostate*; and not be saved, any more then *Judas*, who fell finally, as other reprobates doe, though never so eminent in the Church. Howbeit, we will not say that any fall away, from the grace of Gods secret *election*, but from an *outward sanctification*, it is possible that elected persons may for a time fall; yet not without great *sinne*, no more then the temporary falling away of the incestuous person in the Church of *Corinth*, and others also, which the Scripture maketh mention of, who were the deare Saints of God, yet (for a time) fell from their stedfastnesse.

But now I will examine your reasons what they are, whereby you say * *That the holinesse of children here, is not meant of any holinesse in relation to any Church-covenant.*

* Pag. 4. lin. 4 t
Pag. 5. lin. 1, 2

First, (say you †,) *That which is an effect of regeneration, is not brought to passe by generation (though the parents be holy) but to be of the covenant or kingdome, is the proper effect of regeneration*, Joh. 3. 3. *without which none can see it (much lesse be of it) or enter into it; therefore it cannot be brought to passe by generation, though the parents are holy.*

† Pag. 5. lin. 3
to lin. 9.

Ans. That *regeneration* is brought to passe by *generation*, I will not affirme; The *infants* of *beleevers* are *regenerated* [before they are *borne*] this you cannot justly deny; for *Jeremie* and *John Baptist* were *sanctified* in the *wombe*; and the *privileadges* of *beleevers* are alike precious: Not that it commeth by the means of their *naturall birth*, or *generation* after the *flesh*; but by the Spirit of *regeneration*; howbeit, it is a certaine truth, that the *Saints generation* doth not hinder *regeneration* [in any of them:] *Generation* doth not worke *regeneration*, but *generation* causeth distinctio of persons, that what was one in the *root*, is become more in the *branches*; or what was one in such a *branch* growing on such a *roote*, bringeth forth other *branches*, or (as it were) little *spriggs*, who are in a growing condition (or in a way of thriving) so long as they are borne up and receive nourish-

Abrahams ho
ly action wa
Levites by in
putation. Se
Heb. 7. 9.

ment from the *roote*. And this division, or distinction, by way of derivation, doth not simply make qualities contra-distinct and opposit one to the other, or break the conjunction or contraction between them, or take away the vertue of the roote from them; For *Abrahams* act of obedience which he did before *Levi* was an infant, was imputed unto *Levi* afterward, which act was an act of *obedience*, even a *fruit* of *faith*, which cannot be without the *Spirit*.

Now when *Levi* was borne, should they have sayd, that he was an *unregenerated Infant*? Nay, rather it may be thought that they esteemed as well of *Levi* (in his infancie) as *Eve* did of *Seth* in his *infancie*, when *Seth* was borne, shee did not say, *God* hath sent mee a *young Heathen* (or *Canite*) (though the *seed* of *Caine* was hers by *generation*) but (saith shee) *The Lord hath sent mee* [*another seed*] *in stead of* [*Abel*] *whom Caine slew*. Marke now, shee did not say, in stead of *Caine*, or in stead of *Caines-infants*, (which did indeed spring naturally from *Adams* loynes,) but in stead of [*Abel*] (saith shee,) Therefore (I say) it is apparent, that (though *generation* did not worke *regeneration*, yet) shee *beleeved* in *God*, and had so much *faith*, to put a reall difference between *Apostates*, and those who were not *Apostated*, but were spiritually holy: And in that it is said that *Seth* was *in stead of Abel*, it is a plaine *Argument*, that as *Abel* was in the *Covenant*, and as *Abel* was a *member* of the *Church*, so was *Seth*, according to his name, so was he set (or appointed) instead of *Abel*; for the saying imports that he took the *roome* of *Abel*, as when one *plant* is removed out of a fruitfull soyle, and another planted in stead thereof.

And seeing God refuseth not the bodies of his Saints, but accepteth of them in his gracious *Covenant* (though they are generated persons) it plainly argueth that *generation* doth not hinder *regeneration*. And therefore it appeareth that this your reason (concerning *generation* and *regeneration*) is of no force against the *holy Children* spoken of in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. but rather maketh for them, as shall be further made to appeare. And all which you have said here doth not prove that the holinesse of *children* there, is not meant of any holines in relation to any *Church-Covenant*, which is the thing for which you brought it.

The *Infants* of *beleevers* are *visibly holy* in relation to *faith*, and the *holy Covenant*. *The unbeleeving yoak-fellowes abiding with their beleeving yoak-fellowes, are sanctified by them* for this end; *Else were their*

Children uncleane, but now are they holy. So sayth the holy Apostle *Paul*, (1 Cor. 7. 14.) *Your children are holy*, that is to say, the *children of you beleevers*, (in *Covenant* with *your God*) they are the *children of the Covenant*, differing from those *children* that are *unholy* and out of the *Covenant*.

But against this you argue, that *what is an effect of regeneration, is not brought to passe by generation* (*though the parents be holy*.) And I suppose, that those *Merit-mongers* (keeping still to their principles) may beleeve the contrary; I meane such *Merit-mongers*, who (against the *Gospel* of *free-grace*) do labour vehemently to shut out all *beleevers infants* from the *new Jerusalem*, and so doe in their conceptions rank them with *dogs* and *whoremongers* without, and judge them not to be in the *Covenant*, or *regenerated* (because they have not a *natural capabilitie*, to *discerne*, *apprehend*, and both *actually* & *verbally* professe faith, in their own persons;) yea, they judge all *infants* to be *visibly* in one *condition* (and out of the *Covenant* in *visibilitie*) without putting any *visible* distinction between the *Infants* of the *Church*, and the *Infants* out of the *Church*. But if that which is an effect of *regeneration*, were to be brought to passe by *generation*, they might with some colour of truth, ranke them all in one *visible estate*, (considering that they are all *generated*.) And then there had been no weight in the Apostles speech concerning this matter; But we are to know that the Apostle had good reason for what he sayd; The Master of spirits was his instructer, whose words are not to be wrested and perverted, and so made of none effect, but are discreetly to be observed, and faithfully obeyed. And though some doe despise *the Lords vessells of small quantitie*, even *holy infants*, *the young Olive plants of beleeving parents*, esteeming them *unregenerated*, yet wee are taught to esteeme highly of them, and to honour them as the *precious Saints*, whom the *most high God* hath *regenerated*, and *seperated* to himselfe, as his *peculiar treasure*, who are *justified*, and *sanctified*, and *saved* by him; and therefore ought to be *sealed* unto him by *Baptisme*, as such *holy Infants* in the time of the *Law* were sealed unto him by *Circumcision*.

Rev. 22. 14, 15.

And you your selfe doe grant, that *to be of the Covenant or Kingdome, is the proper effect of regeneration*, Joh. 3. 3. *without which none can see it*, (much lesse be of it.)

Consider what you say; for here you must confesse, that (seeing all that see the *kingdom* of *God* are *regenerated*) either the *Infants* of

of *beleevers* (which die in their *infancie*) are *regenerated*, or elſe that they ſhall never ſee the *Kingdome* of *God*, much leſſe be of it. But Chriſt hath teſtified that the kingdome of heaven conſiſteth of ſuch, and therefore wee may ſafely conclude, that though they die in their *infancie*, yet they ſhall ſee the *kingdome* of *God*; and therefore it appeareth, that they are *regenerated*.

What will you ſay now, in anſwer to your argument, ſeeing it maketh not againſt *holy infants*, but for them? Surely you will denie that they have any of the effects of *regeneration*, or elſe you will denie your owne *argument*, or the *Scripture* of *God*, (which declareth that they are in *covenant*,) or elſe confeſſe, that the *infants* of *beleevers* are to be accounted *holy perſons*, in *covenant* with *God*, and *heires* of his heavenly *Kingdome*, according as the holy *Scripture* teacheth us; one of theſe you will doe, if ſilence prevent you not.

Moreover, I know not how you take the being in the *Covenant* or *Kingdome*; there is a two-fold being therein, to wit, *externall*, and *internall*, *outward*, and *inward*, *visible*, and *invisible*, (as I obſerved before, concerning perſons entrance into the *Church*.)

Act. 8. 13. *Simon Magus beleeved, and was* rightly *baptized* with the *outward Baptiſme*, therefore by conſequence, he was *viſibly* in the *Covenant*, even *outwardly*, and *externally*; He was an *elected Saint*, ſo far as men could or were to judge then at that preſent time, though his *heart* was not *upright* in the ſight of *God*; and therefore he was not of *Gods Kingdome*, nor in the *new Covenant* in *Gods ſecret account*, nor *regenerated*, no more then *Judas Iſcariot*, though the *Apoſtles* themſelves eſteemed never ſo highly of him. But the *Infants* of *beleevers* are *viſibly* in the *Covenant*. And wee are to *judge* all that are in the *Covenant viſibly*, to be *elected*, *regenerated*, *ſanctified*, *heires* of *righteouſneſſe*, *children* of *God*, and of his *heavenly Kingdome*, till they appeare unto us, either by ſome *viſible demonſtration* of *their owne*, or *evident manifeſtation* of *others*, or *teſtification* of *Gods*, not to be that which before wee were to judge them to be.

Deut. 29. 29. O minde this well, that *Secret things belong unto the Lord our God, but thoſe things which are revealed, belong unto us and to our Children for ever.*

Secondly,

Secondly, (say you *) *Contradictions cannot be the effect of one and the selfe-same Covenant, in one and the selfe-same respect: but for one parent to be a beleever, that is, of the Church, when the other parent is not, to produce a holy seed,* (that is) *in the Covenant,* 1 Cor. 7. 14. *And for the other parents, to be one a Jew, and the other a Babylonian; the one a member of the Church, the other not, to produce an unholy seed* (that is) *out of the Covenant, and to be put away, both wife and all borne by her;* as *Ezra* 10. 3. (you say) *is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respect. Therefore it cannot be the effect of one and the selfe-same Covenant.*

* Pag. 5. lin. 5 to lin. 19.

Ans. That is a *contradiction* which is opposed to a contrary thing, as light is to darknesse. And that is an *effect* which flowseth from a Cause or ground.

The ground why *God* gave *Abraham* the *signe* and *seale* of his *righteousnesse*, was *Abrahams faith* in beleeving *Gods Covenant*; For *Abraham* had first the *Covenant*, and *faith* to lay hold upon it, and afterward the *seale* thereof. The ground why *Abraham* did administer *Circumcision* (*Gods holy signe and seale of the righteousnesse of his faith*) was *faith*, in *beleeving* the firmenesse of *Gods promise*, and the effectuall power and efficacie of the Ordinance of *Circumcision*; which (*Circumcision*) had the denomination of the *Covenant* it self *, because it was a *signe* thereof. I say, *Abrahams* action of *Circumcision* was done in *faith*, otherwise it had been sinne unto him *. But he added unto his *faith* this vertue, (this effect of the *New covenant*) to yeeld *obedience* unto *God*, in performance of this *holy Ordinance* upon his *infants*, according to *Gods* appointment.

Rom. 4. 11.

* Gen. 17. 10.

* Ver. 11.

* Rom. 14. 23.

Baptisme (being come in the roome of *Circumcision*) though it be more *generall*, yet it hath an equivolence with *Circumcision*; Wherefore (it being not contradictory thereunto, but sealing up one and the *same Covenant* of *life*,) As *Circumcision* was to be administred upon the *infants* of *beleevers* in former time, so *Baptisme* is to be administred upon the *infants* of *beleevers* now.

Col. 2 11, 12.

Now though every *contradiction* argueth a *difference*, yet every *difference* maketh not a *contradiction*. But to restraine (or lessen) the *priviledges* of the *Saints* (under the *Gospel*) is not onely to make one *Covenant contradictory* to another, but also the *New covenant contradictory* to it selfe, which is not of a fading nature, but of a flourishing nature, and hath flourished, (and doth flourish) more *under* the *Gospel*, then it did *under* the *Law*.

Wherefore if you doe conceive, that 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is of a lesser extent then *Ezra* 10. 3. you are mistaken; but if you will say, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. is of a larger extent. Wherefore have you brought *Ezra* 10. 3. to unsold it? Except it be to prove forcibly hereby (against your selfe,) how that all *beleevers infants generally of what Nation soever*, have *greater priviledges* now, since *Christs death*, then they have had heretofore.

As for the second part of your Argument (considering that it wanteth *explanation* one way, and *proofe* another way) it will not stand you in any stead, to prove what you would have it prove, (to wit) that *the holinesse spoken of* (1 Cor. 7. 14.) *is not a holinesse in relation to any Church-Covenant.*

Indeed, if you had set it downe thus; That *for one parent to be a beleever, and the other an unbeleever, to produce a holy seed in covenant, and the same parents remaining in the same estate without alteration, to bring forth an unholy seed, and out of the Covenant; is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respect.* Or thus. *For one parent to be a beleever, and another parent to be an unbeleever, to produce a holy seed. And for the like parents in the same respects, to produce an unholy seed, is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respect.* If you had reasoned thus, and so proved it, then you had done somewhat like to your undertakings; but in speaking *generally* of *parents*, in *covenant*, and out of *covenant*, without noting in *particular*, the difference that was between these *sanctified* & *unbeleeving wives* (mentioned in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) and those *unbeleeving wives* (mentioned in *Ezra* 10. 3.) (who were not then *sanctified* to *beleevers* for that purpose) you even loose your selfe.

But you say, it *is a contradiction in one and the selfe-same respects*, and have not explaned nor declared what it is a *contradiction* of; whether of the *New covenant*, or of the *old covenant*, or of both *covenants*. Therefore declare plainly, what *covenant* you thinke this divorcement in *Ezra* to be an effect of? Was it an effect of the *New covenant*, or of *the old*? you may know, that neither *covenants* did allow them to marry those cursed persons. You ought also to minde, that one *Israelite* might be divorced from another *Israelite*, in the time of the Law; and this precept was granted and written them by *Moses*, (Deut. 24. 1.) *for the hardnes of their hearts*, (Mat. 10. 5.) But this (in *Ezra* 10.) was not a bare grant, but an absolute command; not barely permitted (or granted) unto them, *for the hard-*

nesse of their hearts, there is more in it then so. For those wicked persons in whom they formerly took delight, they were forceably to put away, & it was not left to their libertie, whether they would put them away or no, but it was an injunction layd upon them, under penaltie of *Gods curse*; for they perceived Gods heavie wrath was hanging over their heads, ready to seaze upon them, unlesse there were some speedy redresse.

And it evidently appeareth, that you have not well read (or considered) the Scripture, for if you had, you would soone have seen a great and weighbie reason, pressing these sonnes of God to put away these daughters of men, and those *unholy children* borne of them, for they (in uniting themselves thus unto them) had made themselves one with them; yea, they had made themselves one with the abhominable Nations (as appeareth by *Ezra* 9. 1 compared with *Deut.* 7. 26.) *An accursed thing, like the accursed thing; And did not separate themselves from the people of those Lands, doing according to their abhominations.*

And therefore there was a speciall cause why the *children* of those *Idolaters*, (in *Ezra* 10. 3.) should be put away, They were not *visibly holy*; the *wives* were not *sanctified* unto them, to bring forth a *visible holy seed*. *The holy seed was mixed*: But the *Apostle* saith to the *beleevers*, in 1 *Cor.* 7, 13, 14, 15. *That the unbeleeving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is sanctified by the husband; Else were your children uncleane, but now are they holy. But if the unbeleeving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases, but God hath called us to peace.*

Now wee are to take the *holinesse* and *unholinesse*, to be a *holinesse* and *unholinesse* in reference to *visibilitie*; for those that were *holy visibly*, might be *unholy invisibly*; and those that were *unholy, invisibly*, might be *holy visibly*. But the *Saints* of *God* were not to judge any *holy*, except they had cause so to doe, and ground of perswasion arising from some *visible demonstration*, either from *God*, or from men, according to the direction of the *Word*. The *visible holinesse* of these *holy children* of *beleevers*, here specified, arose from their *visible* being in *covenant*, & from the *sanctification* of the *unbeleeving* yoak-fellows to their *beleeving* yoak-fellows. The spirituall *uncleannes* or *unholines* wch the *unholy children* had, was in reference to *visibilitie*; & so when he speaketh of *holy children*, proceeding fro a *sanctified wife*, he hath reference to *visibility*; the *unbeleevers* are *sanctified* to the *be-*

leevers, els were the *children unclean, but now are they holy*; to wit, in *visibilitie*; for the ground of the *childrens visible holinesse* was, first, from the *parents* being *visibly* in *covenant*; Secondly, from the *infants* being his *children*, against whom there was no exceptions, they being conceived by such a *wife*, who did not depart from him; and therfore the *children* are *visibly holy*; Thus when the *Vines* are visibly of *the Vine of Sodome and of the feilds of Gomorrha, the grapes are visibly the grapes of gall, and their clusters are bitter* *; *but when the wife is visibly as a fruitfull Vine by the house-side* of him that feareth the *Lord*, the *children* are (to be estemed) as *Olive plants* **.

* Deut. 32. 32.

** Psa. 128. 3. 4

A. R.

* Pag 5. lin. 19. to lin. 35.

Thirdly, (say you*) *It appeares from the Jewish Church-state, from whence this successive holinesse and beeing in the Covenant is concluded to come. The Prosolyte that was to be brought in, was to circumcise all his males.* Exod. 12. 48. *Where wee may conclude, that his females were included in that time in the males, there beeing* (say you) *no other ordinance of admission for them; Whence* (you say) *it will follow, that if the Jewes Church-state, from whence* (you affirme) *this succession of beeing in the Covenant is derived) doth not admit in any consideration of any lawfull beeing of parents, the one a member of the Church, the other not, to produce a seed within the old Covenant, that then such a thing under the new Covenant, cannot be concluded to proceed from that rule, but* (you affirme) *the former is true from the ground before layd, and that therefore the later is also true, and if not from that rule, then from none, But not from that by consequence of the former argument, therefore from none.*

Lin. 19, 20, 21.

Ans. This is set downe obscurely, You say*, *It appeares from the Jewish state, from whence this successive holinesse and beeing in the Covenant is concluded to come?* What *successive holinesse?* and what *beeing?* and what *Covenant* doe you here meane? and who are they that make this conclusion?

* See before pag. 39.

* Gen 17.

* Gal. 3. 17.

* Lin. 21, 22, 23.

It hath been proved before, that the people of *Israel* had two *Covenants* *, one established with *Abraham* *, another long after at *Mount Sinai* *; But for Confirmation of your speech, you say *; *The Prosolyte that was to be brought in, was to circumcise all his males,* Exod. 12. 48. *Where wee may conclude, that his females were included in that time in the males, there beeing* (say you) *no other ordinance of admission for them.*

Ans. You spake before of a *successive holinesse*: But what *holines* was this which the *Prosolytes* had, that were never on the *Church*

before?

before? Was this a *successive holinesse*? Surely this doth not import any other *holinesse*, but what is by *faith* in *Christ*; Wherefore you may see that you have not rightly applied this place of Scripture to prove your *successive holines*: It was *faith* professed by the *parent* that brought in his *seed* with him; it was not his beeing *circumcised*, but his *beliefe*, which was alwayes to goe before, even as *faith* now is to goe before *Baptisme*, and to be *professed* before a *man*, or his *seed*, is to be admitted to the ordinance of *Baptisme*. Now the *Prosolytes* were to *circumcise* all their *males*. But wee doe not reade that the *Lord* did command the *Prosolites* to put away their *unbeleeving wives*, they being married unto them before, (even when they were Heathens) but they might still retaine them, and have *children* by them, capable of the *ordinance* of *Circumcision*. Whereas you speak of *admission*, I thinke you meane admission to the Passeover, for they made themselves one with the people of God, by beleeving the *promises of God*, which thing they were to doe before they were *circumcised*, and *circumcision* was administred afterwards, for the *sealing* and *confirming* of that *faith* before professed.

Now how you understand, *that the females were included in the males*, I know not.

Whether doe you meane in his *male children*, or some other *males*?

If you say, they were included in his *male children*; Then I put the case, that he had *no males*; how then? were his *females* included in the *males* that were not?!

But your speech, (in charitie) may have this construction, That *seeing the Lord did command the Prosolyte to circumcise his male children, that very command did intimate that his female children were in the Covenant, and according to their capabilitie to assent to Gods ordinance, that is was good & holy, though they were not to receive it, yet had a right to whatsoever came in stead thereof.* And this beeing not to be *received* by them *actively*, it must needs be construed that they were *implyed imputatively*. This then was a great *priviledge*; for without this *imputative holinesse*, they could not be numbered * among the *living* in *Jerusalem*, but rather counted among the *uncircumcised Philistians*, neither could they without this imputativenesse be admitted to receive the *Lords Passeover* * ? which was a figure of our *blessed Saviour Jesus Christ our Passeover, which is sacrificed for us* *.

* Isa. 4. 3.

* Exod. 12. 43, 44 47.

* 1 Cor. 5. 7.

But from hence you collect a ſuppoſition, and upon your ſuppoſition you ground a poſition; Your poſition is, *That if the Jewes Church ſtate (from whence (you would have us take notice that you ſay) this ſucceſſion and beeing in the covenant is derived) doth not admit in any conſideration of any lawfull beeing of parents; the one a member of the Church, the other not to produce a ſeed within the old Covenant*, your poſition (grounded upon this ſuppoſition) is, *that therefore ſuch a thing under the new Covenant, cannot be concluded to proceed from that rule.*

Now, it would be knowne, what you meane by *parents*, whether you meane any *parents* whatſoever! or but ſome onely; for it doth not follow, that becauſe ſome were not admitted, that *therefore no unbeleevers were allowed to abide with their beleeving yoak-fellowes, for producing of a holy ſeed in Covenant.*

But let us ſee what proofe you have, upon which you ground your *ſuppoſition* and *perſwaſion*.

The former is true (ſay you) *from the ground before layd, and therefore the latter is alſo true.*

To which I anſwer; I know not (in *particular*) what *ground* you here meane! but this may ſuffice that what you have before layd, is anſwered fully before.

But becauſe you thinke the *former* to be *true*, *therefore you conclude, the later is alſo true*; *and* (further you ſay) *if not from that rule, then from none; But not from that by conſequence of the former argument, therefore from none.*

Now, I know not what you meane by theſe words, Doe you meane that *the* former, *and* later *of this your* argument *is* true, *from that* Rule, *and if not from that* Rule, *then from* none, *but not from that, by conſequence of the former* Argument, *therefore from* none!

Surely you are out here, on either ſide! Neither do I know what *Rule* you mean, nor *what*, nor *whoſe Argument* you mean: Doe you mean by that *Rule*, a *Rule* of *Scripture*; or only ſome *poſition* grounded upon *Scripture*; you ſhould know that *Ezra* 10. 3. will not beare out your *poſition*, neither will any tittle of *Scripture* elſe, for though the *Jewes* were to put away theſe *wives* there mentioned, yet it doth not follow (as you would inferre) that therefore *the Church of the Jewes allowed not in any conſideration, of any lawfull being of ſome parents* (*the one a member of the Church, the other not, to produce a holy ſeed* within the *old Covenant*,) (though they allowed not of other ſome.) And therefore your *Argument*, both *ſuppoſitive* and *poſitive*,

together with the *ground*, is fallen to the ground, and maketh nothing against *holy Infants* being *visibly* in the *Covenant* with their *believing parents*.

You should know that it is evill to make any *Conclusion*, [from any *Scripture*] *which is not concluded thereby*, or *included therein*.

But that the *Jewes Church state allowed in no consideration of no lawfull being together of parents, the one a member of the Church, the other not*, [*to produce a holy seed in Covenant*;] is not *concluded thereby*, nor *included therein*; therefore it is evill to make such a *Conclusion therefrom*.

But if you meane by *Rule*, the *Rule* of *Scripture*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. or *Exod.* 12. 48. You may know, that all this maketh nothing for your purpose neither; but is also directly against you.

Now whereas you lay downe, a *positive argument*, [to confirme your former speeches,] *and crosse the same, by saying, and if not from that rule, then from none, but not from that, &c. therefore from none.*

I suppose it is some over-sight; *Wherefore, I intend not to wade any further to finde out the depth of it, till I see an* explanation *thereof from you.*

But in the meane time, I will give you my conceptions further, concerning *Exod.* 12. 48. (which is the Scripture cited here by you) and so leave it to your consideration.

God commanded the *Proselyte*, to *Circumcise all his males*, Exod. 12. 48. (to wit) *all his male Infants* (and *all* those *males* in his *house*. who in sincere affection, did desire the *ordinance* of (*Circumcision*) though his *wife* (the *mother* of those *Infants*) were neither *Jew* nor *Proselyte*. And his *male Infants* [which he had by that *woman*] were (of necessitie) to be *circumcised* [in their *infancie*] and not to be reckoned *without*, but *within* the *Church* of *Israel*. For we reade that the *Lord* commanded him to *circumcise all his males*; but did not injoyne him to put away his *wife*, (which he had before his *Conversion*) though shee were no *believer*. Exod. 12. 48

Marriage being honourable amongst all men, Heb. 13. 8. Shall wee thinke they were to breake it? An honourable *mariage* according to *Gods ordinance*, dissolved without any just cause, or waighty ground, was a derogating from the first *institution* thereof; and such a thing which we never read, that *God* commanded or allowed the *Proselytes* to doe; though their *wives* could not be perswaded to become *Proselytes*.

Yea,

Mat. 5. 31, 32. & 19. 8, 9.

Yea, and though *Christ* himselfe (in some case) doth allow that a man may put away his *wife*; and *Paul* declareth the same in effect, when he sayth, *If the unbeleever will not abide, a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases (but God hath called us unto peace.)*

Mar. 10. 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. * Mat. 19. 8.

Yea, and although such a *divorce*, doth not argue a hard-heartednesse in the partie offended, nor was condemned (but allowed of) in *Christs* time (though it were done after the manner of *Moses*) yet touching other divorces, which proceeded from a hard-heartednesse, *Christ* did not allow of such, but sayth, *from the beginning it was not so* *.

And therefore wee are not to imagine, that the *Lord* did command or injoyne the *Prosolytes* (in the time of the Law) to breake the bond of *matrimony*, by dissolving that *mariage* which once was *honourable*, neither ought we to thinke, that the *conversion*, or *faith* of the one *parent*, made the *mariage* which before was *honourable*, any more the dishonourable; and if it did not, then wee may *lawfully* conclude, that they needed not to be *maried* over againe, or *seperated* the one from the other by *divorcement*, so long as the *unbeleevers* were content to abide with their *beleeving yoak-fellowes*, but that they were rather to remaine together in love and amitie, and bring forth a *holy seed* in *Covenant*; such a *seed* who were in their *infancie* to be ranked with the *Israelites holy infants*. So for the *Prosolytes* to claime the *priviledges* of the *Jewes holy off-spring* for his owne *Infants*, though borne of an *unbeleever*, was no sinne in him, nor contradiction of the *new Covenant* of *God*, but the effect of one and the selfe-same *Covenant*, he being commanded to *circumcise* them, even all his male *Infants*, in which you your selfe grant that the *females* were included in that time.

Now I conceive, that if any of the *Prosolytes daughters* at his entrance in, did refuse to come in, shee could not be compelled violently, but was still, as shee remained so to be esteemed without, and numbered not amongst the living in *Jerusalem*, but the dead in *Palestina*. And therefore by the same rule, if any of his *male children*, (who were at yeares of discretion) would not be content to come in with his *father*, as his *father* was to reckon him among the *uncircumcised*, so was he not to *circumcise* him, nor compell him to be *circumcised*, till he submitted voluntarily; yet if this *Prosolyte* had male *infants*, borne of her that was *sanctified* to him, though she did not *sanctifie* him, he was to *circumcise* them, and to rank his *bo-*

by infants (both male and female) among the *circumcised Salemites*; and to put such a reall difference between them and his disobedient *children*; so between *holy* and *prophane*, as between *members of the Church*, and *not of the Church*; as between circumcised *Israelites*, and uncircumcised *Philistines*.

And so the *holy Apostle Paul*, 1 Cor. 7, 14. teacheth all *believers* to esteem such *Children holy*; and directly opposite to those *Children*, whose *unbelieving parents* are not so much as *sanctified* to any *believer* for procreating a *holy seed*: and therefore the *Infants* of *one*, or both *believing parents*, are to be esteemed *holy*; and it is a sinne to rank them with those *infants*, whose parents are not any one of them in *Covenant* with *God*, or at least so to be esteemed; for wee have nothing to doe with *secret things*, which *belong* only *unto God*; *but things revealed* wee are to look into, and so to *judge of the tree by the fruit*; and in doing thus, we shall not doe amisse, or commit sin, because we so judge, though things fall out afterward contrary to our former expectation, since those persons declare themselves otherwise then before they did; or that *God* discover them unto us to be otherwise, then wee were formerly to esteeme them.

But to this objection, **That they are here termed holy, and are so to be esteemed.* You answer. * Pag. 5. lin. 3 *A. R.*

**That so were the unbeleeving Jewes, when they were broken off,* Rom. 11. 16. *and so is the unbeleeving wife in this place; yet neither of those are to be baptized for their being tearmed holy; and therefore not Children for their being here tearmed holy.* * Pag. 5. lin. 3 37. 3

To which I answer, that you doe not observe the scope of the *Apostles words*, for he would not have us to judge, that those are *holy* in *visibilitie*, who are *visibly Apostated*, and are cut off; for the *Apostle* speaking of the *Apostate Jewes*, sayth, *What shall their receiving be but life from the dead* *? *For* (sayth he) *if the first fruits be holy, so is the whole lump; and if the root be holy, so are the branches* *. Intimating, that those *branches* are *visibly holy*, which *abide* in the *Vine*, and *Olive tree*, and receive nourishment from, and are borne up of the *root*; And the Apostle declareth that those *unbeleeving Jewes* were *broken off*, and were not then partaker of that *benefit* which the *beleeving Gentiles* had, by being *grafted in* (in stead of the *Jewes*) and so made partaker of the *root* and *fatnesse* of the *Olive tree*: yea, & further, the *Apostle* declareth the cause of the *Jews cutting off*, namely, *unbeliefe*; Through *unbeliefe* they are *broken off*, and there- * Verse. 15. * Verse. 16. Ver. 17. Ver. 18. Ver. 19.

20. fore he exhorteth them *to beleeving*, [*Be not high-minded, but fear,*
21. *fearе, and to take heed, and to behold the bountifulness and severity of God:*
22. *Toward them which have fallen, severity; but* (saith he) *toward thee*
bountifulness, if thou continue in his bountifulness; or else thou shalt be cut off.
23. *And they also, if they abide not still in unbelief, shall be grafted in: for God*
is able to graft them in. So that it appeareth the *Apostle* would teach us, that their abiding on the *Olive tree*, doth demonstrate them to be *holy*, (in the appearance of men.) Howbeit, those are *holy*, (in the sight of God) who shall be saved, though they are not known unto men to be) *holy*, but ought to be esteemed *unholy* in *visibilitie*. So the *incestuous person* of the *Church of Corinth*, (when he was cut off from them) was by the *Church* to be esteemed *unholy* in *visibilitie*; but afterward when he repented, he was then to be esteemed *holy* by those persons who formerly (and rightly according to *visibilitie*) esteemed him *unholy*, even at the time when he fell from
4. 3. his stedfastnesse. And so it is said, *that he that is left in mount Sion, and in Jerusalem, shall be called holy, even every one that is written among the living in Jerusalem*: So it appeareth, that all we for them to be of the number of those, who are in *mount Sion*, and *in Jerusalem*, wee are not to esteeme them *holy*: What they are in *Gods secret* account, his *sacred Majestie* knoweth; but the revealed will of *God* hath directed us, not to call those *visibly holy*, who are *visibly unholy*, (as all *visible unbelievers* are,) nor are we to esteeme those *unholy* outwardly, who are outwardly *holy* (as all *visible Believers* are) for the *Apostle* putteth a difference between *branch* and *branch*, between *visible Believers* and *visible unbelievers*, as we must doe between the *members* of the *visible Church*, and those that *Apostate* therefrom, and are cut off.

But the *holy children* of *Believers* (in their *infancie*) cannot justly be said to *Apostate* from *God*, to *degenerate* from that *heavenly stock*, and *holy olive tree*, in which they are by *faith ingrafted*, and therefore well might the *Apostle* teach us, that we are to esteem them *holy*, whereas you say, *It is not unlawful to say so of the place.*

Ans. It is not so. The *Apostle* saith not, that the *unbelieving wife* of the *believing husband* is *holy*, but *sanctified*, but he declareth that the *children* are *holy*.

And as for the *baptizing of such branches* (that are *broken off* before they are *grafted in again*) of the *unbelieving wife*, before shee be a *believer*, we plead not, but alledge the contrary; for they are

not

not *visibly holy*, as you would inferre, but they are *unholy* in *visibility*, and are not to be esteemed as written among the *living* in *Jerusalem*, but as *dead in sins and trespasses*, till they *repent*, and *beleeve*, and *live* thereby; and so the Apostle sayth, *What shall the receiving of the unbeleeving Jewes be, but life from the dead*; But so long as they are *spiritually dead*, they are not to be esteemed *holy*, nor reckoned among the *living in Jerusalem*. For as such *unbeleevers* were not meet to be *members* of the *visible Church* in the time of the *Law*, no more are they meet to be *members* of the *visible Church*, in the time of the *Gospel*; for as the *Church* of *God*, both was, and is a *spirituall holy Church*, so it hath refused (and doth and ought to refuse) all those persons that are not *living stones, holy*, and *spirituall*; for *holinesse* (sayth *David*) *becometh thine house, O Lord, for ever.* Psal. 103. 5. Rom. 11. 1

Next, you rehearse a question, *What holinesse is here meant to the Children?*

To which you answer, *That it is not that holinesse that accompanieth faith, and such holinesse onely is available to the admittance into the state of the Gospel, and to have right to Baptisme.*

To which I answer, that it is to be taken for that *holinesse* that accompanieth *faith*, and therefore it is available to admit them into the state of the *Gospel*, and giveth them *visible* right to *Baptisme*; and this may appeare unto you from the *Apostles* testimony, which declareth that if one of the *parents* be a *beleever*, the *children* are *holy*, different from those *unbeleeve children* whose *parents* are neither *holy*, nor *sanctified* to the *holy*, to produce a *holy seed*; and therefore I conclude, that we are to account the *Infants* of *beleevers* to have that *holines* upon them, which accompanieth *faith*, and giveth them *visible right* to *Baptisme*; & they are to be judged to be of the number of *Gods elect*, as really, as those, are to be judged, who *professe faith*, and manifest *obedience* in their owne persons.

And it is further to be minded, that *visible Saints*, who make a *verball profession*, and walke *holily* in outward appearance, though we cannot infallibly tell whether they have *faith* or no, they are to be *baptized*, and we are not to dreame that wee can discerne internally in men, seeing *God* only knoweth the *heart*, and *no man knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of a man that is in him*; yet where we see a *holy verball profession*, and a *life* and conversation annexed thereunto, and correspondent therewith, *outwardly*, though *the inward qualifications* be not according to the requiring of the *Word*,

yet wee are to judge them to have that *internall true holinesse*, without which no man shall see the *Lord*, and also that the *Lord* hath admitted them into the *fellowship* of his *Son Jesus*, and into the state of his *Gospel*, and that they are as *lively* precious stones, as living fruitfull plants, and therefore are to be accounted to have as much right to *Baptisme*, as he that manifesteth more *holinesse*. So it is said of *Simon magus*, that he *also beleeved, and was baptized*, and yet afterwards when he manifested *evill fruits*, *Peter* said unto him, *Thou hast neither part nor lot in this matter; for thine heart is not right in the sight of God. Repent, &c. for I perceive that thou art in the gall of bitternesse, and in the bond of iniquitie.* And therefore we are to *baptize* those whom we are to judg to have *holines internally*, though in *Gods* sight they have it not; That is to say, Those that have *holinesse outwardly*, are to be admitted into the *outward visible state*; and are to have the *outward Baptisme*; they being to be judged to have the *inward graces*; as the *holy children* of *beleevers* have in *visibilitie*, and so are to be esteemed in the judgement of charitie; *which thinketh no evill.* But what is the reason why you thinke, that the *holinesse* ascribed by the *Apostle* to the *children* of *beleevers*, is not that *holines* that accompanieth *faith*; Is it because they cannot work? Is it so indeed?! I tell you, that the Scripture teacheth us, that *those that are of the faith, (though they cannot work) the same are the children of Abraham*, and that *the children of the promise are counted for the seed*, and that *Jacob* was a *childe* of *promise* in his *infancie*; And that *faith* and *works* are different things; And therefore though the *holy children* of *beleevers* cannot *work*, yet the *Lord* imputeth *righteousnesse* unto them without *works*; And yet we are to minde, that the *Lord* would not have his *people* to cease from *working* and to be *idle*, so long as they are *able* to *worke*. But when they have neither *will*, *skill*, nor *ability*, (as many a *visible Saint* that is in years may want, and yet be no *Covenant-breaker*) then the *Lord* accepteth of them, and imputeth his *righteousnesse unto them*, as if they had done all the *holy workes* which ever were done in the world by any who were *imputed righteous*. *God* is a *wise God*, and knoweth that his *Saints* can doe nothing without him, nor act further then they have *capabilities*, therefore in his *mercie* he exacteth no more. *God* in his wisdome knew that the *Infants* of *beleevers* were *capable* of *passive Ordinances*, and therefore he instituted the same to be imposed upon them, and administred unto them; But as for *active ordinances* which they could

could not performe, nor had *naturall capabilitie* to doe. *God* did not require it at their *hands*, no more then he did require the *Proselytes females* to be *circumcised*, who (as you say) were implyed in the *males*. And this doth in no way eclipse the *Glorie* of *Christs mediatorship*, but advanceth the *free Grace of God*, and the *righteousnesse* of *Christ*, far above all the *works* in the *world*. But to affirme that the *infants* of *beleevers* have not the *true holines*, w^t accompanieth *faith*, is (in a manner) to darken the *Glorious* Sunne of *Righteousnesse*, and the light of his *Gospel*, with a *meritorious* smoake of corrupt *doctrine*, arising out of the *bottomlesse pit* of sotie mans deceipfull *heart*.

But let us heare what you say further for confirmation of your affirmation.

True is it, that in the time of the Law, and state of the Jewes, and old Covenant, there were same fœderally, and outwardly holy, and outwardly uncleane, and then all men, yea, all things in the world, were distinguished by this kinde of holinesse: So the uncircumcised were then unholy, and they of the Circumcision holy, and might not accompanie with the other, Act. 11. 3. *And accordingly had they their outward washings and purifications, for these their outward pollutions: all which were but typicall things, and all these and such like distinctions are now abolished with that State, and quite taken away out of the world by the comming of Christ; and this is evident by* Peters *vision,* Act. 10. 11. &c. *expounded by himselfe in the* 28. *verse, where he sayth, That God had shewed him, that he should not call any man polluted or uncleane. Whence it is cleare, that now all men in the world are as cleane as the Circumcised, and those as polluted in the Gospel-sense as any other; for now all are as one and alike in Christ Jesus, as may appeare by these Texts,* Rom. 10. 11. Col. 3. 11. Gal. 3. 28. & 5. 6. *And as none then without this legall and outward holinesse, ought to partake of those legall performances and worship, nor be admitted thereunto, without being first circumcised in the flesh, and so made legally holy,* Exod. 12. 48. *So now none are acceptable, or ought to partake of the Gospel, worship and ordinances, without the Circumcision of Christ, which is of the heart and spirit,* Col. 2. 11. Rom. 2. 28, 29. *And this inward spirituall truth, was typified by that outward fleshly shadow: Hence therefore I will conclude, that the Apostle means no such kinde of holinesse in this place, for the beleevers children to have. Nor is there any such kinde of holinesse now in the world amongst men, nor is this or any other kinde of holinesse (save onely that true holinesse that accompanies the new creature) available to Baptisme.*

A. R. Pag. 6. lin. 5.

To which I Answer. All this which you have said here, maketh nothing against the *infants of believing parents* for so much as they are declared to be *holy* now under the *Gospell* 1 Cor. 7. 14.

The cessation of the *circumcision* of the old law, pleadeth their *divine right* to whatsoever came in stead thereof, considering that *Christ* came not to *impoverish* them, but to *inrich* them; If he tooke away any *ordinance* from them, which was *typicall*, he left them that which is *substantiall*, and the like we may say, concerning the *outward holinesse ceremoniall*, which had still relation to the *covenant* and *Church* of *God*; which if it were taken from them, shall we thinke they were left so naked, and bare, that they had not as substantiall *holinesse*, as they had before; *God* doth not doe by *holy men*, as theeves do by honest men, even strip them of their ornaments, and so leave them to shift for themselves, and get other where they can. But our *heavenly Father*, careth for all his *children* in a speciall maner, both for great and small, for young as well as old. He taketh nothing from them, which he knoweth is profitable to them, or beneficiall for them, but giveth them as great, if not greater in stead thereof; If he know they have a *necessity* of it, it is his will and pleasure they should not be debarred from it. And therefore seeing *baptisme* is come in stead of *circumcision*, as *holy infants* then were to be *circumcised*, so *holy infants* are now to be *baptised*, and as God declared unto *Abraham*, saying, that such *infants* * Gen. 17. 13. *needes be circumcised*, so we may know that *baptisme* being come in the roome of *circumcision*, such *infants* must needes be *baptised*. And therefore as *holy infants* then had need of a *Saviour* to come, and therefore were *circumcised*, in token that *Christ* was theirs; so holy *infants* now have need of *Christ* to come, and therefore are to be *baptised* in token that *Christ* is theirs also.

And may the *circumcised* accompanie now with the *uncircumcised*; yea surely, and this is a great *plea* for *holy infants* being in *covenant*, and doth *really* signifie, that it is a *visible spirituall holinesse* which differenceth them now from *heathen infants*; considering that *God* never taketh from his people any thing wch differenceth them from other *people*, but he leaveth them the substance of that type, wch substance doth difference them *spiritually* now. Therefore the *Lord* calleth his *people* (now under the *Gospel*) to come out from among the Idolatrous *heathens*, and to *seperate* themselves, and not 2 Cor. 6. 17, 18. to touch the *uncleane thing*, and promiseth that he will be a *Father*

unto

unto them, and that they shall be his *sons and daughters*; That is to say, that as he was a father to the *families* of the *Jewes*, who were *severed from strangers*, so likewise is he a *Father* to the *family* of the *true and Catholick Church*, who obey his *voice*, and so *God* did gratiously accept of the *infants* of *believers*, who were *severed* from the *Gentiles*, even so doth he accept of the *infants* of *believers*, who are *severed* from *Idolaters* now. I will, saith he, *be a father unto you*. Now he that is a *father* to the *inhabitants* of *Jerusalem*, and the *house of Judah*, he cannot but be a father to their *seed*, their *children*, their *young ones*, their *tender babes*, their *little ones*, their *sucking children*, their *young calves*, their *small quantities*. Despise not therefore the *infants* of *believers*, for though in *quantity* they are *small*, yet in *quality* they are *excellent*: therefore *suffer the little infants to come unto Christ, and forbid them not, for of such is the Kingdome of Heaven*. And therefore they have that *baptisme*, which accompanieth *faith*, and are in the *state* of the *Gospel*, and have right to *baptisme*, as the *holy infants* of the *Jewes* (in the time of the law) had right to *circumcision*.

And true it is, that in the time of the *Law* there were some *severall and outwardly holy*: But these were *ceremoniall* of the *Church*. And in doth not argue, that because they had *ceremoniall holinesse*, therefore they were not *spirituall* in *visibilitie*, the contrary rather appeareth from what hath been before observed. Againe, you should consider, that there were some who were *spiritually* cleane, and yet in respect of *bodily diseases* were *uncleane*: so we are to think that every one that was defiled in their *persons* by touching of *dead folks*, or *unclean persons*, that had *issues*, or *leprosie* (or the like) were therefore *defiled* in their *soules*, or reach thereby out of the *Covenant*, or that they ceased then to be *visible* members of the *Church*: No surely. But we are to know, that those who did any of these things *ceremonially*, were to *suffer* for their doing, could purifie themselves *without repentance*, as when any sin of *ignorance*, or knowing is neglected to bring their *trespasse offering*, then sin was increased, & they were to bear their iniquities for transgression whereof more was required then to have yeares of a *perfect* were outwardly polluted *ceremonially*, though he did not defile his person by any *act* of his, he was to be *clean* according to the *Law of God*, which thing if he did not, *sin* remained upon him, it was his *sinne*, and surely it could not be such a way by any *outward washing*, without *repentance* and *mourning* for the *sinne* which he should have done before, which *ceremoniall washings* and *purifications*,

* Isa. 22. 22.

* Ver. 24.

Luk. 18. 16.

* This is to be understood of a *ceremoniall holinesse*, for the *members* of the *visible Church* now, are *outwardly holy* (that is to say) in *visibilitie*, without which wee cannot esteeme them to be *holy inwardly*.

* Lev. 5. 3, 4, 5.

* Lev. 4. & 5. & 6.

* Lev. 14. 8.

See Lev. 17. 16

tions, were to lead them to *Christ*, who was then to be manifested in the *flesh*, and a *Saviour* to save them from their sinnes, which the *blood of bulls*, and *goats*, and *outward washings* could not doe away*; no more then the outward *Baptisme*, and the *Lords Supper*, (*Gods holy* and *blessed Ordinances*) will take away our *sinnes* now; for *Christs blood* is onely effectuall for this purpose*; he is *the Lambe of God which taketh away the sinnes of the world. Joh.* 1. 29.

* Heb. 10. 4.

* Rev. 2. 5. Heb. 10. 5. & 8. 14.

But our chiefe poynt is not here about *ceremoniall circumstantiall shadowes*; for we all grant, that the *ceremonies* of the *old law* are *ceased*.

And to *argue* that (because they were then subject to *legall pollution*, and some of them had it,) that therefore they had not the *inward* and *spirituall cleannesse*, is a vaine and groundlesse thing so to thinke; for *the Good Lord was mercifull unto every one that prepared his heart to seek the Lord, the Lord God of his Fathers, though he were not cleansed according to the purification of the Sanctuary*;* that is, though he had not that *outward purification* which you speak of.

* 2 Chro. 30. 18, 19. They had not time to *purifie* themselves, yet they did eat of the *Passeover*.

And their *purifications* and *washings* (wch you mention*) they were to teach them the benefit wch they had and were to have *spiritually* by *Jesus Christ*. Their *circumcision* of the *flesh** also, was to teach them the *Circumcision* of the *heart**; all which *circumstantiall Ordinances*, though they are *ceased*, yet we have the *substance* of them in other *Ordinances*, and that *outwardly*.

* Pag. 6. lin. 11.

* Gen. 17. 10, 11. Rom. 4. 11.

* Deut. 10. 16.

And further, it is to be minded (concerning the *people* of *Israel*) that their *conformitie* unto the *Lawes* of *God*, did really *demonstrate* unto men, that they were *spiritually holy*; and so now the *conformitie* of *Gods people*, to the *Lawes* of *God*, doth give sufficient demonstration of their *holinesse* in the sight of men, whereby they are to judge them to be communicable persons in a *spirituall* way.

And though the *uncircumcised* were then *unholy*, (as you speak*) yet they were such *uncircumcised*, who were not to be judged *circumcised* in their *hearts*; and though persons then were *circumcised* both in *heart*, and *flesh*; and did yeild *universall obedience* to *Gods commands*, yet through some accident they might have a kinde of *ceremoniall defilement*, and yet retaine their *visible holinesse* still.

* Pag. 6. lin. 9.

See Lev. 14. 8.

You should also mind, that the *people* of *Israel* (after the *Law* was given in *Mount Sinai*) many of them were *uncircumcised* in *flesh**, yet they were (at the time of their *uncircumcision*) a *holy peculiar people unto God*, and none were like unto them*; and therefore your alledging that there was a difference between the *circumcised*, and the

* Josh. 5. 5.

* Deut. 7. 6. & 26. 18, 19. & 33. 29.

the *uncircumciſed*, and that the *circumciſed Iſraelites* might not then companie with the *uncircumciſed Heathens*, is of no force againſt this truth, even, that the *Infants* of *beleevers* have that *holineſſe* which accompanieth *faith*; for though *circumciſed perſons* were not to accompany with the *uncircumciſed*, yet it was meant of thoſe *uncircumciſed perſons*, who *were aliens from the common-wealth of Iſrael, and ſtrangers from the Covenants of promiſe*; and not of thoſe who were then *members* of the *Church* of *God*; and therefore it was not meant of all *uncircumciſed perſons*; for then the *parents* ſhould not have kept company with their *Infants*, before they were *circumciſed*, but were to deliver them to other *uncircumciſed* perſons, to keep till the eight day, wherein they were *circumciſed*; And then the *uncircumciſed beleeving Gentiles* were not to be *circumciſed*, by the *circumciſed*, but by the *uncircumciſed*: Which to *dreame*, is meere *fooliſhneſſe*; and therefore it appeareth that your Collections have no footing againſt *holy infants*.

Some *uncircumciſed perſons* might be accompanied with, and ſome *Circumciſed perſons* might not be accompanied with.

To the poynt then; Seeing that the *Infants* of *beleevers*, though *uncircumciſed*, might be accompanied with (in the time of their *uncircumciſion*) and that by the *circumciſed*: It evidently ſheweth, that there was a great difference between them, and the heathen *Infants* of *uncircumciſed unbeleevers*. And ſeeing the *uncircumciſed infants* of *beleevers*, might be *lawfully* accompanied with, and were different then from *unbeleevers*, it is apparēt that they were *holy* then, though *uncircumciſed*. And ſeeing that *beleevers infants* (though *uncircumciſed*) were *holy* in the time of the *Law*, and diſtinguiſhed by their *holineſſe* from the *Infants* of *unbeleevers*; and ſeeing that *Jeſus Chriſt* is ſtill one, and the ſame; and that the *ceremoniall holines* is ceaſed; it plainly argueth, that when the *Apoſtle Paul* ſpeaketh (in 1 *Cor.* 7.14.) of the *holy children* of *beleevers*, had by a *ſanctified wife*; he meaneth ſuch a *holines* which is not ceaſed, but remaineth *permanent*, and doth *viſibly demonſtrate* thoſe *perſons* who have it, to have *right* to *Baptiſme*.

And as *Circumciſion* did not give *faith* to the *Infants* of the *Church*, nor adde the *Infants* of the *Church* to the *Church*, (no more then any other perſon) but rather confirme them in it. So *Baptiſme* now, doth not bring *regeneration* (or *faith*) unto ſuch, (or unto any other perſons) as many fondly imagine, neither doth it adde them to the *Church*, but rather confirme them therein.

g. 6. lin. 15. Touching *Peters vision*, which you mention *, *that God shewed him, that he should not call any man polluted or unclean.*

It is good to understand in what sense it is spoken; for wee may rightly call all the *visible members* of *Antichrist* polluted, let them be what they will be, *high* or *low*, *great* or *small*; though they have, and *usurpe* the *ordinances* of *God*, yet they are *polluted persons* so long as they remaine in that estate; (even as the *Apostates* in the time of the *Law*, though they usurped *circumcision*, and other *Ordinances*, yet they were *polluted persons*) and these remaining in that sinfull estate, they are not *cleane*, neither *legally* nor *evangelically*.

Lin. 8. To your inference *, from *Act.* 10. 13. I answer, That *in the Gospel sense*; those that are *seperated* from *Idolatry*, and those that are *Idolaters*, are not all one in *Christ Jesus*; for how can any be sayd to be in *Christ*, so long as they are *visibly* out of *Christ*? Wherefore it is to be understood, that as the *wicked*, of whatsoever *Nation*, *degree*, om. 2. 8, 9. or *sex* they be, are *all one* out of *Christ*; so, on the contrary, the *Saints* cv. 22. 15. of *God*, of whatsoever *Nation*, *degree*, or *sex* they be, are *all one* in *Christ*, Rom. 10. 11. 12. 13. Gal. 3. 28. & 5. 6.

And this sheweth us to put a *visible* distinction between those who are *visibly holy*, and those that are not. But the *infants* of *beleevers*, are *visibly holy* (as hath been proved before) and therefore wee are to *judge* them in *Christ*, and one with him, *members* of his *mysticall body*, and different from those who are not *visibly holy*, but are out of the *Covenant*.

Pag. 6. li. 25, 26, 27. Whereas you say *, that *so now none are acceptable, or ought to partake of the Gospel, worship, and ordinances, without the Circumcision of Christ, which is of the heart and Spirit.*

I answer, That none ought to be *baptised*, before they are *circumcised*, or *washed spiritually* in the *heart*, (at least so far as may be discerned by *men*) neither ought any to presume without the *inward*, and *outward Baptisme*, to lay *hands* upon the rest of the *holy institutions* of *God*, which *properly* and *peculiarly* are tyed to the *Church*. And the *Proselytes*, or *beleeving Gentiles* in the time of the *Law*, before they were *circumcised* in the *flesh*, they were to be *circumcised* in their *hearts*; and before they did *partake* of the *Passeover*, Exod. 12. 48. (a figure of *Christs* body) they and their *holy seed* were to be * *circumcised* in *flesh*, as well as in *heart*; which *participation* in the *Ordinances* then, was not to be limitted onely to the *outward fleshly shadow*, no more then our partaking of *Baptisme*, or the *Lords Supper*

now, ought to be onely limitted to the *outward elements*, of *Water*, *Bread*, and *Wine*. But as for the *Infants* of *beleevers*, they ought to be judged to have the *circumcision* of *Christ*, which is of the *heart* and *Spirit*, (as hath been formerly proved, and shall be further shewed,) and therefore it is apparent, that they are acceptable, and may *lawfully* have the *Ordinance* of *Baptisme* imposed upon them; for they being proved to be *members* of the *visible Church* of *Christ*, it appeareth, that they are to be *judged* in *Christ*, and *new creatures*, and that therefore the *true holinesse* accompanieth them. And this being so, what then will follow, but that according to your owne *confession*, they have *right* to *Baptisme*.

Further you say; *If it be objected, that in respect of Justification, it availeth nothing, but to Baptisme it may.* Pag. 6. lin. 3

To this you Answer*, *That that which availeth to Justification and salvation, doth according to the Rule, onely availe to Baptisme; for if thou beleevest with all thy heart, thou art justified,* Act. 13.39. *and shalt be saved,* Act. 16.31. *and mayest be baptized upon the same, and no other grounds,* Act. 8.37. Lin. 37. to Pag. 7.

To which I Answer; As is the *objection*, so is your *answer*, without *distinction*: for there is a difference between *justification* in the sight of *God*, and *justification* in the sight of *men*; All those persons who are *outwardly holy*, may be *justified* in the *sight* and *apprehension* of *men*, & *ought* to be *baptized* upon this ground, though their *heart* (knowne onely to *God*) be (like the *heart* of *Simon Magus*) *not upright in the sight of God*. But the holy *Word* of *God*, is our *Rule* whereby we are to *judge* both *beleevers* and their *infants* (now under the *Gospel*) to be in *covenant*, *regenerated*, *sanctified*, and *adopted* unto *God*; the *children* of the *promise* in their *infancie* (as the *infants* of *beleevers* were in former time.) And upon this very ground, the *Infants* of *beleevers* now may *lawfully* be *baptized*, as the *infants* of *beleevers* (who were members of the *Church* in the time of the *Law*) were *lawfully circumcised*.

By the Word persons must be justified, and by the Word they must be condemned, whether it be in the sight of God, or of men onely.

To the objection*, *That all that were baptized by the Apostles themselves, were not saved, &c.* You *answer*. * Pag. 7 lin.

And say * you *doe grant, that all baptized by the Apostles were not saved, and yet deny the consequence, by distinguishing between the rule, by which they are to be baptized, (which is infallible) and the judgements of men, who are failable, and may be deceived in applying this rule; but it follows not, but that the rule being of God, is still as infallible as God himself* * Lin. 3. to lin. 15.

selfe is; for all that beleeve, shall be saved (which is true as God himselfe is true) yet all who are judged by beleevers to beleeve, doe not beleeve, and therefore are not saved. This failing then here is not in the rule, but in their judgements, who are but men, and can judge onely in the outward appearance, (by their fruits yee shall know them) Mat. 7. 16. *And cannot judge as God, who onely knoweth the heart,* 1 Sam. 16. 17. Jer. 17. 10.

Answ. Though this by construction, may be without contradiction, yet it may have a little further explanation, thus:

That though the *Saints* doe *judge* by the *infallible rule*, concerning *persons*, yet if they alter their *judgement*, according as the *persons* alter, they *sinne* not in the alteration of their *opinion*, because the *infallible rule* doth still guide their *judgements*: As for *instance*:—

The *infallible rule*, doth direct our *judgements* to looke upon all the *members* of the *visible Church*, to be in the state of *salvation*; So the *Disciples* of *Christ* esteemed highly of *Judas*, as indeed the *infallible rule* directed them; but when once he discovered himselfe not to be that in *effect*, which before he was in *appearance*, then they were directed by the *infallible rule*, to alter their *judgements without faile*.

Further: in stead of these words; *Yet all who are judged by beleevers to beleeve, doe not beleeve*; It may be construed thus; That all who *are rightly* judged (or *ought to be* judged) by *beleevers* to beleeve, doe not beleeve; For there is a difference, between what *persons* do, and what they should, or *ought* to doe. And *persons judging* as they *ought*, though their *judgement* is alterable, yet as the *Rule* is not *failable*, neither is their *judgement* by it *sinfull*; but *righteous*, *holy*, *just*, and *lawfull judgement*.

This being construed thus, and so taken, I assent thereunto.

But as for your following inference, I abhorre, and detest from my very *soule*.

Your words are these:

* *But in the baptizing of infants, the case is far otherwise, yea, quite contrary, who will or can faile in judging an infant to be an infant; the failing therefore here is in the Rule it selfe, and so the fault and sinne in the appointer of such a deceivable Rule: This therefore cannot be of God, who is truth it selfe, but must be of man; For let God be true, and every man a lyar. And when doth he shew himselfe more vainly to be so, then when he goeth about to set his posts by Gods posts; and when he teacheth for doctrines, his owne vaine and lying traditions, such as this is.*

Answer.

Anſ. Groundleſſe poſitions and falſe inferences therefrom, are frequent with you; your words import, that in the *baptizing* of *infants*, becauſe none can faile in *judging* an *infant* to be an *infant*, that therefore the fayling is in the *Rule* it ſelfe; and therefore you conclude, it cannot be of God; but of man, a vaine tradition!

The like might be ſayd of the *Circumciſion* of *infants*, in the time of the *Law*, that becauſe they could not *faile* in their *judgements*, in *judging infants* to be *infants*, that therefore the *circumciſion* of *infants* was not of *God*, but of *man*, *a vaine tradition*! and the *rule* was not *infallible*!

But you may know, that for *beleevers* to impoſe the *ſigne* * and *ſeale* * of the *righteouſneſſe of faith*, upon their *children* (in their *infancie*) was *good*, *lawfull*, & *warrantable* *, directed by the *infallible rule* of *Gods* Word; which *rule* was never yet abrogated; therefore it ſtandeth in force, and is not a *vaine tradition*; and ſeeing *God* himſelfe adminiſtred *Baptiſme* upon *infants*, before the *Law* was given in *Mount Sinai*; how dare you ſay, it is not of *God*?

* Gen. 17. 1
* Rom. 4. 1
* Exod. 12. 4
Baptiſme is
us as *Circum*
ciſion was to
the *Jewes*.

Next after this, you caſt your eye upon an *Author*, whom you * call, *A learned and able Author of our times*; *whoſe expreſſion* (you ſay) *you cannot but take notice of.*

A. R.
* See Pag. 7.
lin. 25, 26

Anſ. It may be, you call him *learned*, and *able*, becauſe (as you ſay) *he confeſſeth himſelfe unconvinced of the lawfulneſſe of the Baptiſme of infants, by demonſtration of Scripture for it. And yet he taketh the Baptiſme of infants to be one of the moſt reverend, generall, and unconfrouled traditions which the Church hath, and which he would no leſſe doubt of, then the Creed to be Apoſtolicall.*

And upon this *beliefe* and *confeſſion* of his, you *Paraphraſe* *, ſaying, *No more would I doubt thereof, if I could be convinced by any demonſtration of Scripture for it: But ſeeing demonſtration of Scripture, neither to us is, nor by him can be produced for it, I doe and muſt remaine ſtill unconvinced with him, and muſt needs take it to be a meere humane device.*

* In lin. 3
to Pag. 8.

To which I anſwer, That the *doubting conſcience* cannot be *ſatisfied*, unleſſe *God* doe it by his *Word*, or *Spirit*, but if the *Lord* doe open your *eyes*, and give you *ſight* to *apprehend*, and *comprehend* this *light*, then in it you ſhall ſee clearly this *truth*, even the *lawfulneſſe* of the *Baptiſme* of *holy infants*. But if *God* doe not by his Spirit open your *heart*, the *tongue* of *men* and *Angels* cannot convince you, but you muſt ſtill remaine unconvinced. But how can you expect

that this *Author* (whom you call M^r. *Daniel Rogers*) ſhould produce Scripture for the *Baptiſme* of *Infants*, while he is (as he ſaith himſelf) unconvinced of it by demonſtratiō of Scripture, except you did expect that he ſhould have played the *hypocrite*, & ſo have gon againſt his *Conſcience*; you ſhould know, that *Whatſoever is not of faith is ſin.*

And it doth not argue (as you infer) that (becauſe *no demonſtration of Scripture is brought by him*) that *therefore* none *at all* is brought to you, *by thoſe who* are *convinced of it by the authoritie of* Scripture. This cannot be true which you affirme, conſidering the *many Scriptures* which you acknowledge have been alledged for to prove the *Baptiſme* of *infants*; The demonſtration whereof hath been ſufficiently ſhewed unto you, and therefore if you take it not for *ſatisfaction*, you may remaine *unſatisfied*, and ſtill *unconvinced*, (though *convicted*) with your *alledged Author*, *and take it* (or rather *miſtake* it) (as you eſteem it) *for a meere humane device.*

But further you ſay;

A. R. Pag. 8. *Nor is this Author alone, in deeming the Baptiſme of infants a tradition, for many of the Ancients with him have eſteemed it.*

Origen *calleth it a Ceremony or Tradition of the Church.* In Levit. hom. 8. in Epiſt. ad Rom. lib. 5.

Auguſtine *calleth it a Common Cuſtome of the Church.* De baptiſmo contra Donat. lib. 4. cap. 23. Et de Geneſi ad literam. lib. 10. cap. 23.

To which, I ſay, that things may be *traditionall*, and *commonly*, and *cuſtomarily practiſed*, and yet have *ſufficient ground* and *warrant* in the *Scripture.*

Origen. But in citing *Origen*, you doe not tell us, what he ſayth in the ſame *Epiſtle*, (to wit) that *the Church received Baptiſme of infants from the Apoſtles.*

Auguſtine. And in citing *Auguſtine*, you doe not declare what he ſayth (*in contra Donatiſt. lib. 4. cap. 23, 24.*) that *the Baptiſme of Infants was not derived from the authoritie of man, or Counſels, but from the tradition or doctrine of the Apoſtles.*

Lin. 9. But next of all you ſay, *Eraſmus*, *lib. 4. de Ratione Concio.* ſayth, *that they are not to be condemned that doubt whether Childrens Baptiſme were ordained by the Apoſtles, &c.*

To which I anſwer; No more will I *condemne* thoſe who in weakneſſe doe doubt of the *Baptiſme* of *Infants*, but rather pitie them, and pray for them, and labour, (as the *Apoſtle* biddeth us

concerning

concerning *thoſe that are fallen through infirmitie*) *To reſtore them with the ſpirit of meekneſſe*. But when their *ſinne* cometh to ſuch a *height*, that they reſiſt the *truth*, and run on *wilfully*, and *blaſphemouſly*, with a *leaprous headines*, and that againſt the *Scripture*, and the very *light*, and *law* of *reaſon*, and will not heare *good Counſell*, nor receive *wholſome inſtruction*; then they are not to be borne with, but *condemned*.

Whereas you ſay further, that *Ekius** calleth (*the Baptiſme of Infants*) *a Commandement and ordinance of man*; In Echiridion.

I anſwer, You ſhould know, that it is a *Commandement*, and *ordinance* of *God*, In the *Scripture*.

Whereas you produce the *Papiſts* ⁎, and the *Authoritie of Counſells** (to *jump* with you, and your firſt *learned Author*, cited by you, againſt the *Baptiſme* of *Infants*,) to prove it not to be *warranted* in the *Word*, but grounded upon *tradition*, and not upon the *Scripture*.

I anſwer; It evidently appeareth, that theſe your *erronious conceptions*, and *peremptory concluſions*, are builded upon a ſandy foundation. I pray you, tell me; How can they beleeve a thing by *Scripture*, that *judge* the *Fathers* above the *Scripture*?

And as you thus bring *humane unſufficient Teſtimony*, to prove the *Baptiſme* of *Infants*, to be a *humane invention*; ſo you doe the like in labouring to make *knowne* the *time* when it was invented, a meere *dreame!* and vaine *conceipt* of your *owne*! a thing farre above your reach! And you would by your *humane Authors*, beare your *Auditors* in hand, as if the *Baptiſme* of *infants*, were invented ſome hundreds of yeares after *Chriſt*; which is neither *certaine*, *probable*, nor *poſſible*; and yet you cite other *humane Authors* for it, whoſe hiſtoricall relations (as you have ſet them downe) have no *bottom* upon *truth*, and therfore are to no purpoſe againſt the *Baptiſme* of *holy Infants*. And therefore your citing them, maketh nothing for your purpoſe neither. But you ought rather in this to *mount* above *humane teſtimony*, and leave theſe your two cited *Authors* to reconcile themſelves;) *Goe to the Law, and to the Teſtimony* ⁎, (for whatſoever is not according to that, hath no light in it) and there ſee what *time* the *baptiſme* of *infants* was *adminiſtred*. As for the time of the *invention* thereof, I will not intermeddle, or take upon me to determine at this time; forasmuch as it is ſufficient for us to *know*, that *God* is the *Author* and *inſtituter* of it; the *adminiſtration* whereof was *in the Cloud, and in the Sea*, not long after the *Iſraelites* came out of the *Land* of *Ægypt*. But it was before the *Law* was given

The *obſtinat* thongh *ignorant*, are to b *rejected*, whe they reject the *truth*.

* Lin. 12.

* Lin. 15.
* Lin. 23.

* Iſa. 8. 29.

I thinke that when *Circumciſiõ* of *infan* was inventec then was th *Baptiſme* o *infants* in vented.

given in *Mount Sinai*, many hundred yeares before *Jesus Christ* was manifested in the *flesh*, and therefore your new account is too short a weapon to undermine *Gods holy administration* of *Baptisme* upon
1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. his *Redeemed ones*; Such as the *Israelites* were, whom he brought out of the *Land* of *Ægypt*, and *baptised* in the *Cloud*, and in the *Sea*.

Further, you cite more *humane Authors*, (to speak your *pleasure*)
*Pag. 8. lin. 37. against the *baptisme* of *infants*, as if it were *thrust upon the world*,
*Pag. 9 li. 1, 2. *under colour*, and *pretence*; *foysted* in (say you) *like all other Antichristian devices, have their cloakes and holy pretences.*)

I answer; These are rude words, and words that wee may rather admire at, then imbrace, considering what little ground you have to speake them, and how violently you have wringed them from *humane testimony*, builded also upon mistakings of *humane Authors*. Have you no more feare of *God* in you, then upon such *sleight grounds*, so *publickly* to breake out, and that in such *unseemly tearmes*, against the *Baptisme* of *Infants*, *Gods holy* and *blessed Ordinance*? Now surely, you are not to be *justified*, but *condemned* in your presuming thus to affirme, what you cannot prove; and labouring *sacrilegiously* to take away the *visible* badge of *Christianitie* from *Christian Infants*. Consider what a *dangerous* thing it is to *di-*
Rev. 22. 19. *minish* from *Gods Word*; *He that taketh away therefrom, God shall take away his part out of the booke of life, &c.* And with this consider also what ground you have had, for your evill *perswasion*, *unjust calumniation*, and *sinfull affirmation*. You should know, that the *Baptisme* of *Infants* was not brought into the *world* by *man*, much lesse was it thrust upon the *world*, under *colour*, and *pretence*, and *Antichristian-like*, *foysted in*, (as you unjustly affirme) but *God* in his *love*, and *mercy*, and *bountifull liberalitie*, brought it into the *world*, amongst other *priviledges*, for his *Elects sake*, & did not thrust it upō the *world*, (as you speake) but ordained it in an orderly way, to be *imposed upon* his *Church* and *People*; whose *visible holinesse* gave them *right* unto it; And he did not bring it under *colour*, and *pretence*, as the *Anabaptists* doe their *Baptisme*, in administring *Baptisme* upon *People*, and then telling them, it is *right*, and afterward that it is *wrong*, (and that they must therefore be *baptized* againe, by them in another manner,) and so after they have been *baptized* by them againe and againe, they after a while are restlesse againe and unsatisfied, because he who *baptized* them, was *unbaptized* himselfe upon their own grounds, Nor can they beleeve there is any *baptized*

rightly

rightly in the world. And so they know not upon their owne grounds, what to doe, or how to practise any *Ordinance* of the *New Testament*.

These their *Baptismes* (I may say) are rather to be accounted as *thrustings*, *colourable pretences*, and *sportings*, (and the like) then the *Baptisme* of *holy Infants*; which was brought into the world by the *Wonderfull Counseller*, whose mighty power is to be magnified in all his *noble acts*; who saved *Noah* and his *family* in the *Arke*, when all the *world* of *unbeleevers*, both *young* & *old* perished with the *flood*.[a] Which *figure* answereth the *baptisme* that now is; who *baptized* the *Children* of *Israel* in the *Cloud*, and in the *Sea*.[c] When *Pharoah* and his *Host* were overwhelmed with the mighty waters: who (according to his *blessed promise*,[d] made unto his *People*) sent his *beloved Sonne Jesus Christ*, (our *Emanuel*) into the *world*, to *beare our sinnes*,[e] and to *suffer death* for us, and put an end to our *iniquities*; Who was *buried*,[*] and *rose againe* the third day, according to the *Scriptures*.[f] And at his Ascension into the bosome of his *blessed Father*, he gave *Commission* to his *Disciples*, to *teach* all *Nations*,[g] and to preach the *Gospel* to *every creature*[h]; and to *baptize* those who were to be accounted in the *state* of *salvation*; Who, when his earthly tabernacle dwelt amongst us) declared that the *kingdome* of *heaven* consisteth of such *holy infants*,[i] for whom he prayed earnestly,[k] upon whom he layd his own *holy hands*,[l] pronouncing them blessed with his owne mouth.[m] Wherefore you shew your selfe very ignorant, and exceeding presumptuous, that dare (with open face in the view of the *world*,) so far to deny *Christ*, (in a manner,) as to say that his *Ordinance* of *Baptisme* (administred upon *holy Infants*,) is such a thing, which (by a supposed helpe of *fraile man*) you have declared it to be.

Consider further, how that although all these *Antient Fathers*, whom you have cited, were on your side. And though you should cite many more, in Antiquitie far surpassing the other, yet all is *vanitie* you doe, yea, properly *vanitie* without the *Scriptures*: and as it is to no *edification*, so it will give no *satisfaction*, or *information* to the *doubting soule*, or make any thing for strengthening your *errour*; (though it may harden you and others seduced in it,) but it will be a means rather to adde *griefe*, and *vexation* to your *spirit* at the *day* when you must give up your account, for all your *idle words*, *vaine actions*, & *hard speeches*, when it will be little *available* to you to

a Gen. 7.
b 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21.
c 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.
d Exod. 14. 28.
e Deut. 18. 15.
* Mat. 1. & 2.
f 1 Cor. 15. 4.
g Mar. 28. 19.
h Mar. 16. 15, 16.
* Luke 18. 17.
i Joh. 3. 20, 21, 24.
k Mat. 19. 13.
l Mar. 10. 16.

given in *Mount Sinai*, many hundred yeares before *Jesus Christ* was manifested in the *flesh*, and therefore your new account is too short a weapon to undermine *Gods holy administration* of *Baptisme* upon his *Redeemed ones*; Such as the *Israelites* were, whom he brought out of the *Land* of *Ægypt*, and *baptised* in the *Cloud*, and in the *Sea*.

1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.

Further, you cite more *humane Authors*, (to speak yout *pleasure*) against the *baptisme* of *infants*, as if it were *thrust upon the world* *, *under colour*, and *pretence*; *foysted* * *in* (say you) *like all other Anti-christian devices, have their cloakes and holy pretences.*)

* Pag. 8. lin. 37.
* Pag. 9 li. 1, 2.

I answer; These are rude words, and words that wee may rather admire at, then imbrace, considering what little ground you have to speake them, and how violently you have wringed them from *humane testimony*, builded also upon mistakings of *humane Authors*. Have you no more feare of *God* in you, then upon such *sleight grounds*, so *publickly* to breake out, and that in such *unseemly tearmes*, against the *Baptisme* of *Infants*, *Gods holy* and *blessed Ordinance*? Now surely, you are not to be *justified*, but *condemned* in your presuming thus to affirme, what you cannot prove; and labouring *sacrilegiously* to take away the *visible* badge of *Christianitie* from *Christian Infants*. Consider what a *dangerous* thing it is to *diminish* from *Gods Word*; *He that taketh away therefrom, God shall take away his part out of the booke of life, &c.* And with this consider also what ground you have had, for your evill *perswasion*, *unjust calumniation*, and *sinfull affirmation*. You should know, that the *Baptisme* of *Infants* was not brought into the *world* by *man*, much lesse was it thrust upon the *world*, under *colour*, and *pretence*, and *Antichristian-like*, *foysted in*, (as you unjustly affirme) but *God* in his *love*, and *mercy*, and *bountifull liberalitie*, brought it into the *world*, amongst other *priviledges*, for his *Elects sake*, & did not thrust it upō the *world*, (as you speake) but ordained it in an orderly way, to be *imposed upon* his *Church* and *People*; whose *visible holinesse* gave them *right* unto it; And he did not bring it under *colour*, and *pretence*, as the *Anabaptists* doe their *Baptisme*, in administring *Baptisme* upon *People*, and then telling them, it is *right*, and afterward that it is *wrong*, (and that they must therefore be *baptized* againe, by them in another manner,) and so after they have been *baptized* by them againe and againe, they after a while are restlesse againe and unsatisfied, because he who *baptized* them, was *unbaptized* himselfe upon their own grounds, Nor can they beleeve there is any *baptized*

Rev. 22. 19.

rightly

rights in the world. And so they know not upon their owne grounds, what to doe, or how to practise any *Ordinance* of the *New Testament*.

These their *Baptismes* (I may Ly,) are rather to be accounted as *thrustings, colourable pretences*, and *toyings*, and the like, then the *Baptisme* of *holy Infants*, which was brought into the world by the *Wonderfull Counseller*, whose mighty power is to be magnified in all his *noble acts*; Who saved *Noah* and his *family* in the *Ark*, (when all the *world* of *unbeleevers*, both *young* & *old*, perished with the *Flood*;) Which *figure* answereth the *baptisme* that now is[b]; who *baptized* the *Children* of *Israel* in the *Cloud*, and in the *Sea*[c]. When *Pharaoh* and his *Host* were overwhelmed with the mighty waters[d]; who (according to his *blessed promise**, made unto his *People*) sent his beloved *Sonne Jesus Christ*, (our *Emanuel*,) into the *world*, to beare our *sinnes*, and to *suffer death* for us, and put an end to our *iniquities*; Who was *buried*, and *rose againe* the third day, according to the *Scriptures*. And at his Ascension into the bosome of his *heavenly Father*, he gave *Commission* to his *Disciples*, to *teach* all *Nations*[g], and to preach the *Gospel* to *every creature*[h]; and to *baptize* those who were to be esteemed in the *state* of *salvation*; Who, when his earthly tabernacle dwelt amongst us) declared that the *kingdome* of *heaven* consisteth of such *holy infants*[i]; for whom he prayed earnestly[k]; upon whom he layd his own *holy* hands[l], pronouncing them blessed with his owne mouth[m]. Wherefore you shew your selfe very ignorant, and exceeding presumptuous, that dare (with open face in the view of the *world*,) so far to deny *Christ*, (in a manner,) as to say that his *Ordinance* of *Baptisme* (administred upon *holy Infants*,) is such a thing, which (by a supposed helpe of frayle man) you have declared it to be.

Consider further, how that although all these *Ancient Fathers*, whom you have cited, were on your side. And though you should cite many more, in Antiquitie far surpassing the other, yet all is *vaine*[n] you doe, yea, properly *vanitie* without the *Scripture*; and as it is to no *edification*, so it will give no *satisfaction*, or *information* to the *doubting soule*, or make any thing for *strengthening* your *errour*, (though it may harden you and other seduced in it,) but it will be a means rather to adde *griefe*, and *vexation* to your *spirit*, at the *day* when you must give up your account, for all your *idle words*, *vaine actions*, & *hard speeches*, when it will be little *availeable* to you

a Gen. 7.
b 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21.
c 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.
d Exod. 14. 28.
e Deut. 18. 15.
* Mat. 1. & 2.
f 1 Cor. 15. 4.
g Mat. 28. 19.
h Mar. 16. 15, 16.
* Luke 18. 17.
i Joh. 3. 20, 21, 24.
k Mat. 19. 15.
l Mar. 10. 16.

there *shall none come to you from the mouth of the Lambe*; whose word shall *judge* these *fathers* whom you have cited, by which they shall be *justified* or *condemned*; when they shall not *judge* it, or *condemne* it, (as *Heretickes* formerly have done,) but be *judged* by it.

I have not told you that *Auxentius*, (one of the *Arians Stellaries*, with his *adherents*, (who denied the persons in the *blessed Trinitie*, and *denied* the *Godhead* of *Jesus Christ*,) was one of the first that denied the *Baptisme* of *Infants*.

And that *Pelagius* the Hereticke was a patron of this opinion of yours. Whom *Augustine* and others of the *Antient Fathers*, have opposed by the *Scriptures*, and condemned for heretick, as justly they might: for then it may be you would say, that *Augustine* was an *Hereticke* himselfe as well as the rest, and therefore the citing of him (or any such as he was) can make nothing for our present purpose, in electing the *cause* in controversie: for indeed, after this manner, did M^r. *Smith* (the *Brownist*,) answer M^r. *Clifton*, who was his *opposite* and overthrew his errours.

But indeed I desire that all things may be tryed by the touchstone of the Word of *God*, which is the onely *rule* for every *divine action*, which directeth us *to hold fast that which is good*, and to *judge* of *persons* and *causes* accordingly.

Therefore I desire that what hath bin spoken already in answer to your severall *objections*, and what hath been also gathered from the word of *truth* in vindication of this *truth*, of the *baptisme* of *holy Infants*) may be observed.

It hath been declared how the *promise* is made to all *believers Infants*, as really, as to themselves, or any of their *children*.

It hath been proved, that the *generall institution* of *Jesus Christ*, is no maner of way *lesse generall* then *circumcision*, but more *generall* in respect of the parties upon whom it is to be *administred*.

It hath been minded, how that the *Infants* of *believers* were *holy*, & *members* of the *visible Church* in the time of the *Law*, and that neither the cessation of the *ceremonies* of the old *Law*, nor any thing else, which can be alledged, doth argue that they have not still the *same holinesse* which giveth them *visible right* to *Baptisme*. But seeing the *dispensation* of *Gods grace*, and the *distribution* of his *graces*, are manifolded under the *Gospel*, we are still to esteem the *young Olive plants* of *believing parents* to be *holy*, as well as the *stock* or *branches* upon which they grow. And it being so, we may conclude, that

See before Pag. 3. to pag. 15.

Pag. 15. to pag. 24.

Pag. 24. to pag. 64.

they have *right* to *holy Baptisme*, as their *holy parents* have. And to debar the *holy infants* of *believers* from *Baptisme*, is to reject them, and so (in a manner) it is a rejection of their *holy parents*; a means of their *discouragement*, a *weakning* of their *faith*, a *disconforting* of their *hearts*, yea, and *discouragement* to *others*.

But *Truth* overcommeth all things, if it *grow*, and will *prevaile* against all that oppose it.

Thus having answered directly to what hath been set downe by you, I proceed to the next.

Your next words are these:

But now to the Question, What is meant by the holinesse which children are said to have, 1 Cor. 7. 14. In answer whereto, I shall shew briefly what I conceive it to be, and then leave it to the judgement of the wise.

Answer. If you meane the *holy children* of *believing parents*, (spoken of 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) Let us heare what you say.

I say then it is onely such a holinesse as is opposite to such kinde of uncleannesse, which I take to be this, as if children were not holy, (that is no more then to say) they are not unclean, (to wit) no Baptisands.

To which I answer; That you are greatly mistaken herein. There is no such *restriction* in the *Scripture*, as you conceive, and would gather from thence; for it is apparent, that where the *Apostle* layth to *Believers* (1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) *Else were your children unclean*; he meaneth here such an *uncleanesse*, which he speaketh of in 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. Which *uncleanesse*, *viz.* *of sinne* are *bidden* not to *touch*; *I will dwell in them, and walke in them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore come out from among them, and be yee separated, sayth the Lord, and touch not the* [*unclean*] *thing. And I will be a father unto you, and yee shall be my sonnes and daughters, sayth the Lord God Almighty.*

Observe here, how that this *uncleanesse* is directly opposed to the *holinesse* which those have who are in *covenant* with *God*; who alwayes did put a difference between the *holy* and *prophane*, between the *infants* of the *world*, and the *infants* of the *Church*. And so the *Apostle* (speaking in the *Scripture language*) calleth the *children* of *Believers holy*: *Else were your children unclean*, (saith he,) *but now are they holy*, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. *Else were your children defiled* (say you) *but now are they no more so*. This, you conceive, is the meaning of that *Scripture*: But you should minde, that the *Proselytes* in the time of the *Law*, and the *believing parents* in the time of the *Gospel*, who

A. R. Pag. 9. lin. 21

A. R. Pag. 25.

2 Cor. 6.

Vers. 16.

Vers. 17.

Vers. 18.

The *Apostle* speaketh to the same *people*, and doth the same *Scripture-phrase*, in applying the promise

And doth it no way exclude, but include their posteritie.

confirmation whereof, see the practise of *Peter* in *Act.* 2. 39.

Heb. 13. 4.

...unbelievers, were not all *bastards*: and *legitimation* is a thing proper to *believers*; but *unbelievers* may have it. But when the *Apostle* speaketh of a *holiness*, which the *children* of *believers* have, it is that which is *proper* unto the *Saints* of *God*, and not *common* to *Infidels*, who are without *God* in the *world*, and not to be *sanctified* with it.

You should minde, that the *Apostle* speaketh in the *heavenly language of Canaan*, in the *Scripture-Evangelicall phrase*, giving the *believers infants* such a *stile*, wch the *holy Spirit of God* hath given them, (according as it is plentifully manifested in the *Scriptures* of *God*,) and which is which not given and granted unto *unbelievers infants*. There is no place of *Scripture*, which declareth them to be *holy*. Where fore we may conclude, that there is a great deale of difference between the *infants* of *believers* and the *infants* of *unbelievers*, and that the *unclean* [illegible] opposed to the *holines* of the other, and so [illegible] opposed unto *holy*, as *uncleane*, are (and ought to be) *separated* from *holy* [illegible] *separated* from them ×. And so the *Jewes* (*separated* from *idolaters*) were all *holy*, both *young* and *old*, and *Gods* [illegible] *peculiar people*, which did really demonstrate that [illegible] were unto them. The *Lord* was their *God*, and they were [illegible] in the midst of them, and *sanctified* them unto himself, and gave unto them his *Word* & *ordinances*, and [illegible] *Gentiles* also, who had *proselytes* [illegible] were then made *partakers* of the *like priviledges* with them, which extended unto their *infants*, and [illegible] *infants* of the *Jewes*. Therefore as the *infants* of the *Jewes*, so were the *infants* of the *Proselytes* (of *believing Gentiles*)

And forasmuch as the *distribution* of *Gods grace* (under the *Gospel*) is larger, than they were under the *Law*, the *infants* of *believers* now have [illegible] and [illegible] the *infants* of *believers* had then, and have the *same right* unto *Baptisme*, which is available to [illegible] *Baptisme*, and therefore we may conclude, that when *Christ* came to die for their *sinnes*, he came to destroy their *soules*, and so to [illegible] them, to make them *spirituall Covenanters*, to take from them their *stony hearts*, and leave them to be clothed with the *garments of righteousness*. But surely, we may rather conclude, that *Christ* [illegible] as he was once himself an *infant*, so a *believing parent*, according to the flesh, so he loveth the *infants* of *believers*, because

they

they are Subjects of his kingdome. And as he *suffered for them*, so he doth not onely *come unto them*, but cast his *garment* of *righteousnesse over them*, and *dwell with them*, and *abide in them*; and is a *father unto them*, as he was to the *inhabitants* of *Judah* and *Jerusalem*. Out *God* is a *God* of *truth*, and therefore he will not deceive his *people*, nor break his *Covenant* which he hath made with them; which *Covenant* is to his *Saints* thus; *I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed**: *I will be their God***: So saith the *Spirit* of *Truth*, who will not, (nor cannot) lye. Who for strengthening of his *people's faith*, and encreasing of their *comfort*, that their *hearts* in *loving* him, might be *enlarged*, and their joy in *delighting* in him might be *full*; he did command a *visible signe* and *seale* of the *righteousnesse of faith*, to be imposed upon them, and upon *their seed*, whose *God* he had testified himself to be.

& 18. 13.

Isa. 22. 21.

* Gen. 17. 7.

** Ver. 8.

Now those persons to whom *God* is a *God*, they are *blessed* in a *speciall manner**, and he is a *father* unto them*; and those persons to whom *God* is a *God*, and a *Father*, are *seperated* from *Idolaters*, and are a *holy* & *peculiar people* unto him, directly opposed to those who are *uncleane*, and out of the *Covenant*. But *God* is a *God*, and a *Father* to the *infants* of *believing parents* now, as he was formerly; (for his holy *Covenant* is sure) and therefore such *infants*, (even the *holy offspring*, and *blessed issue* of the *blessed*) are all the *sonnes* & *daughters* of *God*; and are to be accounted amongst the number of *seperated Saints*, in *covenant* with him; for he hath promised to be a *God* and a *father* unto the *believing Gentiles*, (2 Cor. 6. 18.) as he was unto the *believing Jewes*, (Gen. 17. 7. Jer. 31. 1.) Concerning whom the *Lord* saith, *Their children shall be as aforetime*, Jer. 30. 20. whose *holinesse* is directly opposed to the *Idolatry*, of those *Idolaters*, which the *Lord* commandeth his *blessed Saints* to *seperate* from, and is quite contrary to this *uncleannesse*, which *unbelievers*, and their *infants* have; who though they are not *bastards*, yet they are *unholy*, because they are out of the *Covenant*, and *God* is not their *God*, nor *father*; to *hallow* the, as he is to the *holy children* of *believing Gentiles*, and as he was to the *holy children* of the *Jewes*, in *covenant* with him.

* Pſal. 33. 12.
* Isa. 9. 6.
* 1 Cor. 7. 14.
2 Cor. 6. 17.
* Rev. 22. 11, 15.
Isa. 52. 11.
Rev. 21. 7, 8.

Jer. 30. 20.

Thus the Contents of your exposition being not right, wee may justly conceive, that all the *Scripture* which you bring to confirme it, will be wrong in the *application*; and your *grounds false*. But let us heare further what you say.

A. R. Lin. 29. A. R. Lin. 30.

And I will shew my ground by my thus opening the Text.

The believing Corinthians *both men and women, married and single, do joyne in a Letter to the Apostle for resolution of many of their doubts touching their severall conditions, this appeares in the first* verse, *and thence to the* 12, *and their doubts in this particular, and which he answers in the five* verses *following, seemes to be this in effect, as if they should thus write; we being borne anew, and made the Sonnes and Daughters of God by Faith in* Jesus Christ: *and being made holy by his spirit, and taken into Communion and fellowship with* Jesus Christ, *and his* Saints *in light, from an estate of darkenesse and death, from being* Idolaters, *and Children of the* Devill, *have very uncomfortable cohabitation and fellowship with our wives and husbands, remaining still in their naturall and blind condition, so farre different from the estate into which we are now brought: Surely our holy God that bids us touch no uncleane thing, doth not allow us thus to do: And wee feare least wee have done very ill in continuing thus so long, for our Marriage wee cannot thinke but it was dissolved when wee first beleeved: And wee ought then to have put away our wives as the* Jewes *did their strange wives; and unto this the Apostle begins his answer in the* 12. verse *thus*, And unto the rest (*to wit, of your doubts*) speak I, not the Lord, If any Brother have a wife that beleeveth not, if she be content to dwell with him, let him not put her away. And the woman that hath a husband that beleeveth not, if he be pleased to dwell with her, let her not leave him: for the unbeleeving husband is sanctified to the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is sanctified to the beleeving husband, else were your Children uncleane, but now they are holy.

As if the Apostle should have said to them thus, you Corinthians *do doubt of your cohabitation with your unbeleeving married yoke-mates, of which there is no cause, for to the pure all things are pure (that is, all lawfull things) (namely, whatsoever is lawfull in nature or civill use) is sanctified to the beleever, and yet even those things are impure to the impure, or unbeleeving, for even their mindes and consciences are defiled,* Tit. 1. 15. *But to the Beleever all things are pure, (that is, as I have already said) all lawfull things, for things that are unlawfull in themselves cannot be sanctified by the faith of a true Beleever, no not to his use; but must be left and abhorred as sinfull and wicked, which if your cohabitation were such as you in weaknesse judge, then was not your marriage lawfull at the first, then it is not lawfull nor sanctified to you now, as you judge it is not, and then are your children uncleane: But if your marriage were at first lawfull, then your Cohabitations now with your yoke-mates is like-*

wise

else lawfull, and then also sanctified to you now by your beleeving, else were your children uncleane (*that is*) unlawfully begotten and Bastards, but now are they holy (*that is*) Legitimate and no Bastards.

Anſ. Here hath been *many words* to *little purpoſe*, as appeareth by your own *Concluſion*; for the *Tenour* of all is, that which you have affirmed before *; which is your *Concluſion* now *. As if the *Apoſtle* ſhould ſay, *Elſe were your Children* unlawfully begotten, and *baſtards, but now are they* legitimate, and *no baſtards*; A very poore *collection*, or rather *reſtriction* of the *Apoſtles* words! But that this *reſtriction* is in the *Text*, wee muſt take it upon your *bare word*; for you have brought no *Scripture*, which any way cleareth this your Affirmation. But it hath been proved before, that the *Apoſtle* meaneth a *religious holineſſe*; a *holineſſe* in relation to *faith*, and to the *holy Covenant* of *God*; in which *Covenant, beleevers* & their *infants* are now, under the *Goſpel*. And this may further appeare unto you by theſe Conſiderations.

* Pag. 9. lin. 26, 27.
* Pag. 10. lin. 31, 32.

Firſt, That the Apoſtle (in this place of Scripture) ſpeaketh not of all *infants*, but onely of the *infants* of *beleeving parents* in *Covenant*; for he doth not ſay to *unbeleevers*, that their *children* are *holy*, neither doth he direct his ſpeech unto any *unbeleever*, but unto *beleevers*; wherefore this principally concerneth *beleevers*, that they might know the *privioidges*, which appertaine unto them and their ſeed, according to the *covenant* of *God*, which declareth that *God* will be their *God*. Gen. 17. 7.

Secondly, The *Apoſtle* doth not ſay that the [*unbeleeving*] *husband* or *wife ſanctifieth* the [*beleeving*] *husband or wife*, but the *unbeleeving wife is ſanctified in the beleeving husband, and the unbeleeving husband in the beleeving wife*; (that is to ſay, in conſideration that he is *ſanctified* yoak-fellow;) Where wee are to note, that though the *unbeleeving wife* have a privileidge to be *ſanctified* in her beleeving husband, yet not to ſanctifie her *beleeving husband*; nor hath the *unbeleeving husband*, any privileidge to *ſanctifie* his (*beleeving*) *wife*. Nor doth it need (in this caſe) for *beleevers* are *holy* without them; though their *unbeleeving yoak-fellowes* are not *ſanctified* without them.

Thirdly, Wee are to note from the *Apoſtles* words, *Elſe were your children uncleane, but now are they holy*: That becauſe the *unbeleeving wife*

wife is *sanctified* to the *beleeving husband*, or the *unbeleeving husband* to the *beleeving wife*, therefore the *children* are *holy*, else not.

Fourthly, We are to take notice that the cause of the *sanctification* of the *unbeleeving wives* (or that which made them to be so *sanctified*) was two things.

Firſt, Their abiding.

And Secondly, Becauſe their *yoak-fellows* were *beleevers*: if her *yoak-fellow* be a *beleever*, elſe ſhe cannot be ſo *ſanctified* to the *beleever*, for that that is not, cannot be ſaid to be.

Fifthly, The *Apoſtle* treateth of *holineſſe*; which wee are to take for that excellent *ſpirituall holineſſe*, which becometh the *Lords Houſe*, even ſuch a *holineſſe* which *Abraham* and his *infants* had. Which *holineſſe* giveth the perſons who have it, *viſible right* to the *covenant* of *Grace* and *ſeales* thereof. The Apoſtle ſpeaketh of *holineſſe*, and doth no way leſſon it, and therefore conſidering what the *infants* of *beleevers* have been, & what Chriſt hath done for them, wee may well underſtand that the *holineſſe* which they have, now, is a *holineſſe* in *relation* to the *covenant* and *Church* of *God*.

Sixthly, It evidently appeareth from the *Apoſtles* words, that wee may ſafely conclude, that ſuch *children* (ſpoken of here) are different from *heathens*; for the *unbeleeving wife* had not that privilege to bring forth ſuch a *holy ſeed* unto a heathen. And ſo the like may be ſaid for the *unbeleeving husband*, that he could not beget a *holy ſeed* of her that was an *unbeleeving wife*, but it is peculiarly bound up in the *beleeving yokefellow*. Therfore the *children* of one (or both) *beleeving parents* are *holy* indeed, taking the *Scripture* in the largeſt extent.

Seventhly, If the *Apoſtle* had ſaid to the *beleevers*, that their *children* were *unholy*, nevertheleſſe, you might ſtill have made ſuch a *collection*, as you have here, (to wit) that he meaneth that they are no *Baſtards*; but *legitimate*; for the *legitimate children*, whoſe *parents* are neither of them *beleevers*, are *unholy*, and yet they have your *holineſſe* (to wit) that which evidenceth them to be no *Baſtards*. Wherefore that the *Apoſtle Paul* meaneth ſuch a *holineſſe*, which you ſpeake of, we may not in reaſon conclude; but the contrarie, as hath been obſerved before, (namely) that the *Apoſtle* meaneth a *holineſſe* directly oppoſite to the *uncleanneſſe* ſpoken of 2 *Cor.* 6. 17. And alſo in this plaine, 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. Which he ſaith, *Elſe were your children unclean, but now are they holy*. But you (giving the *ſenſe* according to your *ſenſe*, or underſtanding)

derſtanding) ſay it is thus; *Elſe were your children Baſtards, but now are they no Baſtards.*

And further you ſay,

And that this is the genuine ſence of this place, may further and clearly appeare by the generall ſcope of the Apoſtle in the 20, 21, 22, 23. verſes following in the ſame Chapter, *where he after he had reſolved the married Beleevers not to depart from their lawfull yoke-mates, he therein in theſe verſes exhorts Servants and all others, to abide likewiſe in the lawfull callings wherein they were before their* Converſion, *and ſeemeth to tell them in effect thus much; That their being converted to the faith, did in no wiſe releaſe them from any lawfull* Covenants *and civill duties in their ſeverall relations wherein they ſtood before, but bound them to a more due performance of all ſuch obligements towards all men, but in poynt of Religion and worſhip of God, therein they were not to be in ſubjection to any, ſave onely to Jeſus Chriſt, who had therefore bought them with a price.* A. R. Pag. 10. lin. 33.

Anſ. All which you have ſayd here, maketh nothing for your purpoſe, for *vindication, illuſtration,* or *confirmation* of your ſtrange reſtriction of the *Apoſtles* words; but rather maketh againſt you, for as much as the *Apoſtle* deſireth every *beleever* to abide in the ſame calling wherein he was *called.* So that the *beleeving married* perſons had no need to put *away* their *unbeleeving yoak-fellowes*, for as much as the *Lord* allowed them to abide together, and that the *unbeleeving yoak-fellowes* were ſo *ſanctified* for producing a *holy ſeed*; *Elſe were your children uncleane,* (ſayth the *Apoſtle*) *but now are they holy.* But you pretend that you gathered your interpretation (*Elſe were your children Baſtards, &c.*) *from the generall ſcope of the Apoſtle in the 20, 21, 22, 23. verſes following of the ſame Chapter.*

The words therefore I will repeat at large, becauſe you ſhall ſee that here is nothing in theſe *verſes*, which you pretend, or by which you have any occaſion to urge what you doe.

Ver. 20. *Let every man abide in the ſame calling wherein he was called.* Ver. 21. *Art thou called being a ſervant, care not for it: but if thou mayeſt be made free, uſe it rather.* Ver. 22. *For he that is called in the Lord, being a ſervant, is the Lords freeman: Likewiſe alſo he that is called being free, is Chriſts ſervant.* Ver. 23. *Yee are bought with a price, be not yee the ſervants of men.*

Now conſider what ground you had to build ſuch an affirmation, that the *Apoſtle* in ſpeaking of *holineſſe*, (1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) *doth not meane a holineſſe in relation to faith*, and that where he ſayth, *Elſe*

were your children vncleane, but now are they holy; he meaneth, else were your children bastards, but now are they no bastards!

What title of Scripture is here to warrant these your vaine conceipts, in thus opposing *holy infants*? Or upon what *reason* doe you ground these *unreasonable collections*? Is it because the *Apostle* sayth, that the *called of the Lord*, are *the Lords freemen*, the *Lords servants*, & *are bought with a price*? Surely, this maketh nothing against *holy infants* being in *Covenant*; for they are bought with the same price. Christ came not to damnifie them, but to dignifie them; not to make them loosers, but gainers. And all this is wrought by him, in whom is all *fullnesse*, and no *emptinesse*; *riches*, and no *povertie*; *life*, and no *death*; He it is that came to give himselfe a *ransome* for them.

But you would inferre, that because *believers* are exhorted by *Paul* to performe their *civill Covenants*, and *lawfull Contracts* which they have made with men, that therfore it appeareth that the gloss which you gave upon the *Apostles* words, *1 Cor. 7. 14.* is a true interpretation. What weight is in your words? let any one that hath sence and reason judge: For the like might have been objected in the time of the *Law*, against the *infants* of the *Church* then, whom the Lord did call and sanctifie; and cause to approach neere unto him; that because the *parents*, and others, were to performe their *Conditions* and *bargains*, which they made each with other (or with *strangers*) not changing, or going from their word, though it were to their hindrance; that therefore their *holy infants* then had no more *holinesse* then a meer *legitimacie*, nor were different from the *infants* of *Heathens*, and *Infidells*.

Were it not foolishnesse thus to thinke? [much more to affirme] yea, surely! and therefore such affirmations of yours, are to be taken for *senslesse imaginations*, and *vaine conceptions*, not worthy to be uttered to *any* [much lesse unto *many*.] Neither should they (at this time) have been mentioned heer, but to manifest the vanitie thereof; That *reasonable creatures* may not be *deluded*, by such *unreasonable collections*, and *false inferences*; But may examine what they receive before they receive it; and embrace nothing but what is agreeable to the *Rule* of *Truth*.

Further you say;

And this may likewise appeare in Mal. 2. 14, 15. where the Spirit of God by the Prophet sheweth the reasons why their offerings were no more accepted, because (saith he) God hath been witnesse between thee and the wife of thy youth (that is his first wife then living) against whom

thou haſt dealt treacherouſly, yet ſhee is thy companion, and the wife of thy Covenant, and did not he make one, yet had he aboundance of the Spirit, and wherefore one in that he ſought a godly or holy ſeed, therefore keepe your ſelves in ſpirit, and let none treſpaſſe againſt the wife of his youth: *In which words it plainly appeareth that the ſcope of the place is, that thoſe Children which are generated by one man and one woman lawfully married, are a godly or holy ſeed, and thoſe that are generated otherwiſe, are not ſo but Baſtards. And the reaſon of this holineſſe ariſeth not here from any relation they had to the* Jewiſh *State, not from any Church* Covenant, *but meerly from Gods firſt Inſtitution of Marriage in the Creation, and his then providing one woman for one man, and which therefore is of Univerſall concernment to all man-kinde, by the Law of Creation.*

Anſ. Herein you pervert the *Scripture*, and bring ſuch *Concluſions* therefrom, which are not included therein.

Whereas you ſay, it is his firſt wife then living; I aske you why not his ſecond *wife then living? If you will limit it *onely* to the *firſt wife*, then it ſeems by your ſpeech that he might deale *treacherouſly* with the other, and beare no blame for it. But you ſhould know, that theſe *Jewes*, to whom the *Lord* ſpeaketh, were taught to follow the righteous ſteps of their *holy parents*, and not to deale treacherouſly with any of their *wives*.

You ſay, that *the ſcope of this place is* Mal. 2. 14, 15. *&c. That thoſe Children which are generated by one man, and one woman, lawfully married, are a godly, or holy ſeed, and thoſe that are generated otherwiſe are not ſo, but Baſtards.* But that this is the *ſcope* of the place, wee muſt take upon your *bare word*, (or elſe chooſe,) for *Scripture* to prove it you have none. But (by theſe your ſpeeches) it ſeemeth that you would have us to beleeve, that *godlines* & *holines* of *children* depend-eth upō the *parents lawfull generating* of them. And ſo by this it will follow, that all the *legitimate Infidells* in the *world* are *godly* and *holy*, both young and old; which is very ſtrange, and abſurd, and over-throweth the *Scriptures*, which declareth that there hath been alwayes a difference between the *holy* and *prophane*, between *beleevers* and *Infidells*, between the *Infants* of the *Church*, and the *Infants* out of the *Church*; one ſort being *called*, the *children* of *God*, the other, the *children* of *men*.

Againe, This ſpeech of yours in ſaying that the *children* of one *man*, and one *woman lawfully married*, are a *godly* and *holy ſeed*; and thoſe that are *generated* otherwiſe, are not ſo but *Baſtards*. It doth imply

* *Jacob* had 2 wives, *Lea* and *Rachell* the one was elder then the other, and on was married before the o-ther: But th childrenwhi he had by th as alſo thoſe by *Bilha* and *Zilpah*, wer all holy in their *infanci* and ſo are th *Infants of b leevers*, a go ly and *holy ſeed*; and al other *Infant* are otherwiſ whether *legi timate*, or *il gitimate*.

simply that then all *legitimated persons* shall be *saved*, and that no *Bastards* shall be *saved*. And so out of your owne mouth (for ought you know) you bring a heavie *censure*, and *sentence* of *condemnation* against your selfe; for it seemeth by your words, that your owne assurance of *salvation*, must rest meerly upon *humane testimony*; for you know not whether you are *legitimate*, or no, but by the testimony of your *parents*, which if they were not *lawfully married* at the time of your begetting, then where is your *godlines* and *holines*? You have it not at all upon your own grounds; howsoever, at the best, I thinke you will say, that you have it not from your owne *knowledge*, but by *humane testimony*.

But (for your comfort) you should consider, that in a *religious respect*, a *Bastard*, if he be a *Convert*, must not be *rejected*, as a *cast-away*, for although his *father* and his *mother* sinned in his procreation, yet their *sinne* shall not be imputed unto him; neither will the *Lord* reject him any whit the more for his being *unlawfully* begotten. Yea, though *believing parents* should (through *temptation*) derogate from Gods *institution*, by begetting *children* contrary to *Gods Law*, yet we will not say, but as there is *repentance* & *forgivenesse* for the *parents* returning unto *God*, so the *believing parents* may have *hope* (from the *Scripture*, that sweet *fountaine* of *consolation*) that God will not impute that their *sinne* unto their *children*, who never *sinned actually*, but will receive them to *mercy*, with themselves.

So *Davids childe*, which he had by the *wife* of *Uriah* the *Hittite*, though it was *unlawfully begotten* (contrary to *Gods institution* in *Paradise*) yet it doth evidently appeare, that we have no ground to say, that the *infant* was out of *Gods covenant*, any more then *David* was. *David* repented, and his *sinne* was forgiven him, and his *childe* was *cleane*, both in a *civill*, and *religious respect*; the which cannot justly be sayd of any *infant*, whose *parents* are both of them *unbeleevers*, though they are *lawfull husband* and *wife*, and the *childe legitimate*; yet the *parents* (being neither of them in the *Covenant*) were not to esteem any of their *infants* to be *godly*, or *holy*, neither from 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. nor from any other *Scripture*.

In consideration whereof it doth appeare, that there is a *reall difference* between the *infants* of the *godly*, and the *infants* of the *wicked*; and that the *holinesse* which differenceth them, is a *spirituall holinesse*; For in respect of *legitimacie*, some of the *infants* of *unbeleevers* had the preheminence, when some of the *infants* of *beleevers* had it

not

not, and yet the *infants* of *beleevers* (whether *legitimate*, as *Isaac*, or *illegitimate*, as *Pharez*,) were in respect of their *religious sanctification*, the onely *infants*, whom *God* accepted of *visibly* in his *Covenant*: But as for the others, which were out of the *Covenant*, *God* rejected them, whether they were *legitimate*, or *illegitimate*; So then, it appeareth that it is the *holy Covenant*, which demonstrateth the *children* of *beleevers* to be *holy*, and *members* of the *visible Church*, as the *holy Infants* were in former time.

By this you may see, how you are deceived, both in mistaking, and mis-construing the words of the *Apostle*, 1 Cor. 7. 14. and mis-understanding, and perverting the words of the Prophet, *Mal.* 2. 14, 15.

Your next words are these;

In the same sense is the Apostle to be taken, Heb. 13. 4. *where he saith*, Marriage is honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, but *Whoremongers* and *Adulterers* God will judge.

If Marriage be honourable in all, and the Bed undefiled, then the issue of that Bed must needs be undefiled (that is) *cleane and holy; as on the other side, the issue of all unlawfull conjunctions are uncleane, illegitimate, and* Bastards. *Now this holinesse and unholinesse of Children, proceedeth not from the holinesse or unholinesse of the Parents; But from the lawfull or unlawfull conjunction of the Parents in the begetting of their Children, for the Apostle in this place speakes of all men universally.*

That the *Apostle* speaketh of *all men universally* in *Heb.* 13. 4. when he saith, that *Marriage is honourable amongst all*, is (in a sense) true; but that he speaketh of all men *universally* in *Cor.* 7. 14. is not true in any sense; for (the Apostle *Paul* in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. speaking to the *members* of the *Church*, of that which principally concerned them) he groundeth his speech concerning the *holinesse* of *children*, and *sanctification* of the *unbeleever* (to that use) upon the *faith* of one of the *parents*, that if one of the *parents* be a *beleever*, though the other *parent* be an *unbeleever*, the *Children* are *holy*, that is to say, they are under the *holy Covenant*; And so it necessarily implyeth, that if neither *parents* are *beleevers*, the *children* are *unholy*, that is, they are not born *holy*, nor under the *holy Covenant*. For it was *faith* that made the *beleevers yoak-mate* to be so *sanctified* to him, as the *Apostle* speaketh, Because he was a *beleever*, the *Infidell* was *sanctified* to him; For to an *unbeleever* shee could not be *sanctified*, but unto a *beleever*. And therfore the *children* of those *beleevers* were *holy*,

becauſe one of the *parents* was a *believer*, and this *faith* (ſo *ſanctifying* the *unbelieving yoak-mates* to this *end*, and *uſe*) made the *children holy*; which cannot be ſayd of an *infant*, whoſe *parents* are neither of them *believers*; though his *parents* were *honourably married*, and the *bed undefiled* in his procreation, but he is *unholy*, *ungodly*, and out of the *Covenant*, neither of his *parents* being *holy*, nor any of them *ſanctified* then in themſelves, nor *ſanctified* in (by, or to) a *believer*, for producing a *holy ſeed*, ſpoken of in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.

But you goe on ſtill, and ſay, that

A. R. Pag. 11. li. 34. *It ſeems that the holines here of the children, ariſeth not from the faith or holines of the parents, but meerly from the lawfull marriage and conjunction of the parents in begetting their Children.*

? Lin. 38. * *It is even ſo.*

Anſ. Is it *even ſo*? How is it *even ſo*? Doth the *holines* of the *holy children* (ſpoken of in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) *ariſe meerly from the lawfull marriage*, &c? How prove you this? Who revealed this unto you? Belike you thinke your bare affirmation (*is it even ſo*) is ſufficient proofe; It may be, you will ſay, that *Pharez* and *Zarah* were *ungodly* and *unholy*, and out of the *Covenant*, becauſe their *parents* had not *lawfull marriage* at their *conjunction* in *begetting* of them: And alſo that *Davids* illegitimate *Infant* was *ungodly* and *unholy*, & out of the *covenant*, becauſe he was not *lawfully married* to *Berſheba*, before he had begotten him. For ſurely if the *godlines* & *holineſſe* of the *Infants* of the *faithfull* ariſe *meerly* from the *lawfull marriage* and *conjunction* of the *parents* in their *begetting*, then all the *infants* of the *faithfull* (whoſe *parents* have not *lawfull marriage* in their *begetting*) are not *holy*, nor *godly*. But *ſeeing* the *infants* of the *world*, whoſe *parents* were *married* to each other, in their *begetting* were (though *born* legitimate,) yet not borne *holy*, (that is to ſay) not under the *holy Covenant*: And ſeeing that *Davids Infant* was in the *Covenant*, though he was *illegitimate*, (which thing might be ſayd of other *illegitimated Infants* of the *Church* then.) It plainly argueth, that there is a *great gulfe*, betweden the *holy infants* of the *Church* (ſpoken of in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) and the *infants* of the *world*, whoſe *parents* are *ungodly*, and out of the *Covenant*. And alſo it is clearly ſeen, that you fowly miſſe it, in ſaying that the *holineſſe ariſeth meerly from the lawfull marriage and conjunction of the parents in begetting their children*. In all which *ſpeeches* you ſtill croſſe your ſelfe, in what you have ſet downe, in the fourth *Page* of your *Booke**, where you

Gen. 38. 16, 17, 24, 25, 26, 29, 39.

2 Sam. 11. 4, 5.

2 Sam. 11. 27. 12. 16, 17. 23

* See *A.R.* his ſecond Book, Pag. 4.

you enter upon this *particular*, concerning 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. For there you affirme (in *opposing Infants holinesse.*)

First, *That there is* [*now*] *but one Covenant on foot, &c.*

Secondly, *That there is but one manner of entering and being therein.*

And thirdly, That *there is but one holinesse* [*now*] *acceptable with God, &c.* Consider what you sayd there, and that wch the *Apostle* declareth here (in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) That the *children* of *beleevers* are *holy* [*now*] under the *Gospel.* [Now] *are they holy* (saith he) and so *judge* your selfe in reason, whether you doe not wrong the Scripture, [and your selfe also unreasonably] in making this one *holinesse* to be a *meer legitimacie*, proceeding *meerly from the parents lawfull conjunction in matrimony.*

But let us see what further *reasons* you can give for maintenance of this your *opinion.*

For the question or doubt was only whether they might put away, or depart from their unbeleeving yoak-mates, the which the Apostle answers, that they ought not to put them away; and he implies this reason, because they were lawfully married unto them, according to Gods ordinance. *A. R.* Pag. 11. lin. 3

Ans. Here you grant, that the Apostle saith, the *beleevers* ought not to put away their *unbeleeving yoak-mates*; This maketh directly against you; for it doth *demonstrate* that the *children* of *beleevers* are *holy*, as the *holy children* of the *Jewes* were; which *children* were not to be put away, whose *visible holinesse* gave the *beleeving Jewes* a sufficient ground to *administer Circumcision* upon them in their *infancie*; And so *Baptisme* being unto us, as that was to them; the *holy children* of *beleevers* are to have this, as they had that. For these are *holy* now, and have right to this, as those were *holy* then, and had right to the other.

And the Apostle *Paul*, when he exhorteth the *beleeving parents*, not to depart from their *unbeleeving yoak-fellowes*, he yeeldeth this reason, (what ere he implies;) *For the unbeleeving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbeleeving wife is sanctified by the husband*; and for confirmation of this reason (or these reasons) of his, he saith further, *Or else were your children uncleane, but now are they holy*; so that the *holinesse* of the *children*, is the main *argument* which proved that their *unbeleeving yoak-fellowes* were *sanctified*, and so might be *retained*, and not put away. 1 Cor. 7. 14

Next you say;

And this he backs with a double reason: *A. R.* Pag. 12. li. 1, 3, 4, 5, 6.

First,

First, *Because their unbeleeving yoak-mates were sanctified to their use.*

Secondly, *Because their Children, begotten in that state, are legitimate and holy.*

Anſ. That the *unbeleeving yoak-mates* of the *beleevers*, were *sanctified* to their *uſe*, is true; But this is not all, They were *sanctified* to them for this *uſe*, the *male* to *beget*, and the *female* to *conceive*, and bring forth a *holy seed*; or *elſe were your children unclean*, (ſayth the *Apoſtle*) *but now are they holy*. And that their *children begotten* in the *state* of *matrimony*, are both *legitimate* and *holy*, is very true; keepe to this, and then you keepe to the *truth*; *Their children begotten in that eſtate, are legitimate and holy*. If then they are *legitimate* and *holy*, as your ſelfe doe confeſſe here, why will you ſeek to debarre them from the priviledges of the *holy Covenant?* Surely this ſpeech of yours (being cõſidered & compared with your former) you can object nothing *now* againſt them (exeept you croſſe your ſelf) but that they may, yea, and ought to be *Baptized*. But yet I would have you to mind, that it is not their *legitimacie* or *illegitimacie*, which can debar them from *Baptiſme*, or admit them to it; but it is their *viſible holineſſe*, which giveth them *viſible right* to *Baptiſme*. And this is according to your former ſpeeches, in this your Treatiſe, Where you affirme, *That there is but one holineſſe now acceptable with God* ✶, *and ſuch a holineſſe is available to Baptiſme* ✶, *according to the Rule* ✶.

Pag. 4. lin. 8. Pag. 6. li. 2, 3. num. 38.

Next you ſay;

A. R. pag. 22. lin. 6.

On the other ſide, If they were not ſo lawfully married to them, then theſe three concluſions would follow.

Firſt, They would not be ſanctified to them.

Secondly, Their children would be unclean, and Baſtards.

Thirdly, They might and ought to put them away.

Anſ. *Theſe three Concluſions* (you ſay) *would follow, if they were not* [*ſo lawfully married*] *unto them.* Here is a threefold injunction, implyed in theſe three words [*ſo*] [*lawfully*] [*married*]. And theſe you have put as a preparative to your three *Concluſions*; all which are laid downe ambiguouſly.

I doubt not but the *unbeleeving yoak-fellowes* of the *beleevers*, were *ſanctified* to them; but this is not all, their *ſervants* might be ſanctified unto them, and all lawfull things; but their *yoak-fellowes* were *ſanctified* unto them, for this end and uſe, for producing *a holy ſeed*, as I ſayd before ✶. And the *reaſon* was becauſe one of them (being

a *beleever*

a *beleever*) *sanctified* the other; the *unbeleever* was *sanctified*, in, by, or to the *beleever*, for this very *end*, of *generating children* unto him, or rather unto *God*. So that the *beleever sanctified* the *unbeleever*. Which thing could not, nor cannot be said of the *unbelievers*, that they *sanctifie*, or that their *yoak-fellowes* are *sanctified* in them; for they indeed are *sanctified* in themselves. But by your reasoning, *Paul* might as well have said, that the *beleever* is *sanctified* to the *unbeleever*, as to the *beleever*; But so to say, is a *turning* of the *Apostles testimony* up-side-downe. And I doubt not but the *beleevers children* (begotten in that estate of *matrimony*) were legitimate. But the *holinesse* is not taken *simply* from the *lawfull marriage*, but in respect to the *Covenant* of *Grace*, and *Church* of *God*, they being borne *members* of the same, as hath been proved before; Having the *holinesse* and *righteousnesse* of *Christ* imputed unto them. And seeing that *beleevers holy children* had the like *priviledges*, as *Isaacs holy children* had; therefore, as those *children* of *Isaac* were in the *Covenant*; So were the *holy children* of *beleevers* in the time of the *Law*, and so are these now in the time of the *Gospel*. They are even in the *holy Covenant* of *God*, and so are *hallowed* with their *parents*, by the same *God*, who made their *parents* holy; the root is holy, and so are the branches, the first fruits are holy, and so is the whole lump. And upon this *ground*, doth the Apostle *Paul* prove, that the *Corinthians* might *lawfully* keep their *unbeleeving yok-mates*; because that *Else their children were unclean, but now are they holy*; because that one of them was a *beleeving parent* in *Covenant*; for that is the reason both of the *holinesse* of the *children*, and of the *lawfull* retaining of the *unbeleeving yoak-mates*.

If all the *legitimate Children* in the world, have the *holines* spoken of in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. Then all the *legitimate Children* whose *parents* are neither of them *beleevers*, are *holy*: and then it will follow that *unbeleeving yoak-mates* *sanctifie* their *unbeleeving yoak-mates*; But this is not to be thought, for it maketh the Apostle *Pauls* words of none effect, where he bindeth it onely in the *beleever*, and doth not tell us, that the *unbeleever sanctifieth* the *beleever*, or *unbeleever*, but [the *beleever*] *sanctifieth* the *unbeleever*. And this doth forcibly prove the *holinesse* (in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.) to be another thing then a meer *legitimacy*; for it proves it to be a *peculiar* thing unto *beleevers*, but *matrimony* [is not] *peculiar* to *beleeving parents*, no more then *legitimacy* is *peculiar* to their *Infants*; others have the same as well as they.

Whereas you say, secondly, *Their children would be uncleane, and bastards.* Lin. 9, 10.

Thirdly, *They might and ought to put them away.*

How doe you prove this, that they might and ought to put them away? I thinke they might and ought to keepe their owne *Infants*, though *illegitimated*, *Bastards*; Yea, and in some considerations to keep their *wives*. So *David* according to the *Law* of *God*, kept his *illegitimate infant*; and did not put away the *wife* who bare

it, but still retained *her*, and had a *holy* and *elected seed*, by *her*.

So Mr. *Ainsworth* answereth this *Objection* of the *Anabaptists*, by proving unto them, *that* miss-begotten children, *and* Bastards *were not to be put away in respect of civill use; for* (sayth he) *who should nourish, or bring them up, rather then their owne parents?* 2 Sam. 11. 4, 5. & 12. 14, 15, &c.

Moreover, If *unbeleevers* cannot be *sanctified* to beget, or conceive, a *holy seed*, except they be *yoked* unto *beleevers*, as you here grant, (by your words) in saying, that [[*that which is sanctified to a beleever, being unsanctified to an unbeleever, must needs be sanctified unto him by his beleeving. And so the meaning* (*of the translations* whether *by*, or *to**) *is all one, and may be thus expressed; That the unbeleeving wife is sanctified unto the beleeving husband, by, or through his beleeving.*]] Then it will follow (by your owne confession) that though an *unbeleever* be in the state of *matrimony*, yet (except it be with a *beleever*,) the *unbeleever* cannot procreate such a *holy seed**, spoken of in 1 Cor. 7. 14. And to this argueth, that there is a great and manifest difference [in respect of *holinesse*] between the *infants* of *beleevers*, and the *infants* of *Infidells*; And that this *holinesse* proceedeth not meerly (according to your former inferences*) from a *lawfull conjunction*, in respect of *Matrimony*, which is *honourable to all*; Neither doth the *unbeleever*, being *sanctified*, come simply by being in the *honourable state* of *Marriage*, (which those have who are not so *sanctified*) but because she (or he) is coupled in *marriage* with such a *beleever*. Keep still to this, [that the *unbeleeving yoak-fellow* may be *sanctified* to her (or his) *beleeving yoak-fellow*, but not to any *unbeleever*.] And then there will be some more hope, that you will be drawn out of your *Anti-pedobaptistical errours*, for (as I sayd before) this doth shew, that those *children* whose *parents* are neither of them *beleevers*, are not *holy*, nor *sanctified*, by their *birth*, from any ground appearing, in 1 Cor. 7. 14. or any other Scripture.

Moreover, I know none that pleadeth that the *unbeleeving wife* of the *beleever*, should be admitted to *Baptisme*, and *Church-fellowship* with her *beleeving husband*. And yet shee is *sanctified* unto him, in the enjoyment of her, to bring forth a *holy seed*; and therefore is (in this respect) far different from his *cattell*, and *beasts*, with whom he may not so unite himselfe; they are not so *sanctified* to him, as to bring forth a *holy seed*; but his *wife* is; which difference you doe not set downe, when you say*, that shee is no otherwise *sanctified*

then

* Mr. Henry Ainsworth his Answer to the Anabaptists Dialog. pa. 95.

* See A. R. Pag. 12. lin. 19.

* See A. R. lin. 16.

* To wit] not [illegible] visibly [illegible] in the ho[illegible] Covenant, the *infants* of *beleevers*

* Pag. 11. lin. [illegible], 37, 38. [illegible], 14, 15.

* See A. R. [illegible] 12. lin. [illegible], 22, 23.

then *servants*, and his *cattell* and *beasts*. But you should have minded, that the *Beasts* are *sanctified* to him as *beasts*, the *servants* as *servants*, and the *unbeleeving wife* is *sanctified* in him (to him, or by him,) as a *wife*. But touching the *children*, they are *holy*, under the *holy Covenant*; as hath been formerly observed, and proved, and shall be further cleared.

To another Question which you call an Objection; *What do the Children of beleevers have no more privilege then the children of Heathens, Turkes, and Infidells*: You say *,

In respect of the Covenant of Grace and Salvation none at all. A. R.

Ans. If by their *children* here you mean their *infants*, then I absolutely affirme and will prove, that the *infants* of *beleevers* have more privilege then the *infants* of *unbeleeving Heathens*, in respect of the *Covenant* of *grace*, and *salvation*; for *God* hath testified to *Abraham* *, saying, *I will be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee.* And this is the *new Covenant* of *grace*, and of *salvation*, That *God* will be *our God*, and wee shall be *his people*: Which *Covenant* is not made unto the *wicked* and their *offspring*, to *Turkes*, and *Heathens*, who are *without God in the world*. Nor have they any ground to *hope* for the salvation of their *infants*; for true *hope* is grounded upon some *promise* of *God*, which they are destitute of, and where *God* hath made no *promise*, who can expect performance? Touching *secret things*, they belong unto the *Lord our God*, but *things revealed*, appertaine to us and our children * for ever.

A. R. Pag. 12. li. 27, 28.

A. R. * Lin. 29.

* Gen. 17. 7. Jer. 30. 22. Ezek. 37. 27. Heb. 8. 10.

Rev. 21. 3.

2 Cor. 6. 16, 18.

* Deut. 29. 29.

And whereas you say *, *It commeth not by any naturall Birth, but by the worke of the Spirit; for the Spirit bloweth where it listeth*, John 3. 8. *And God is no respecter of persons. But in every Nation, he that feareth God and worketh righteousnesse, is accepted of him*, Act. 10. 34, 35.

* Pag. 12. lin. 30.

I answer; As the *Saints generation* doth not hinder their *regeneration*, so their *naturall birth* doth not hinder the birth of the *Spirit*; for the *Spirit bloweth where it listeth*. And yet the sound thereof may be heard by the *testimonies* of *Scripture*, which declareth that the *Spirit* of *God* is in all that are his, and he hath wrought upon some of the *infants* of *beleevers* miraculously, before they were *born*, and *God* loveth all his *Saints*, without respect of persons *; yea, he respecteth the poorest of their *infants*, before the *infants* of the *world*, which are without, though they are never so *rich*. *In every Nation he that feareth God, and worketh righteousnesse, is accepted with him*, Act. 10. 34, 35.

John 3. 8.

* *God* hath *promised* to *circumcise* our *heart*, and the *heart* of our *seed*: and this is the *work* of the *Spirit*,

And as those *infants* (in the time of the *Law*) whom he claimed visibly for his own in speciall, were not then to be judged destitute of his *Spirit*; no more are such holy *infants* now; for as *Gods Spirit* is the *Spirit of promise*, so *God* is alwayes as good as his *word*.

See A.R. pag. 12. lin. 34.

Whereas you say*, *In respect of the means of salvation, their priviledge in having beleeving parents, is far more then those that have not; because beleeving parents may be a means to bring their Children to the knowledge and faith of Jesus Christ, and so be instruments of their salvation, as Saint* Paul *saith here; The beleeving husband may save his unbeleeving wife.*

I answer; If by *children* here, you meane *infants*, if this be all the *priviledge* you will afford them, I thanke you for nothing! But it is well they are not at your finding; for indeed this measure of yours is somewhat scant.

If they *die* in their *infancie*, how shall their *parents* bring them to the *knowledge and faith of Jesus Christ*? yea, how shall they beleeve that they goe to heaven, if they had not some warrant to beleeve, that the worke of *regeneration* was wrought in them before? If the *righteousnesse* of *Jesus Christ*, and the *graces* of his *holy Spirit* were not *imputed* unto them before? *In death there is no remembrance of God, in the grave who shall praise him?* But the *Comforter* (which would not have *beleeving parents* mourne, as those which have no *hope*) hath informed them, that he is the *Circumciser* of their *hearts*, and of the *heart* of their *seed**; a plain evidence, that they love, and know him, or rather are beloved and knowne of him; He that loved them in their life, will not forsake them in their death; *For the dead which die in the Lord are fully blessed, yea, saith the Spirit, for they rest from their labours, and their workes doe follow them**.

Psal. 6. 5.

Thes. 4. 13.

Deut. 30. 6.

Rev. 14. 13.

But by your words it appeareth, that you *judge* the *infants* of *beleevers*, and *Infidells*, all alike.

Yea, the Infidell *servants*, which serve *beleevers* (if these your words be true,) have a greater priviledge then the *Infants* of *beleevers*; for the *servants* are *capable* of *instruction*, (in respect of a *naturall capabilitie*) but the *Infants* are not.

Now if you will still grant, that the *Infants* of *beleevers*, (though they die in their *infancie*) have a *greater priviledge*, then the *infants* of *unbeleevers*; then you must also grant, that that their *priviledge* resteth in something else, besides the bare *publication* of the *Gospel*, which they are not in their *infancie capable* of.

And

And you ſhould not have over-topped them ſo far as to ſay, that becauſe *beleeving parents may be a means to bring their children to the knowledge, and faith of Jeſus Chriſt*, that therefore they have no more *priviledges*, then the *unbeleeving wife*; As if this were the *greateſt priviledge* which *beleevers infants* have, which *unbeleevers* themſelves may have, *Mark*, 16. 16. But you ſhould rather have reaſoned thus:

Beleeving parents may *publiſh* the *Goſpel* to their *unbeleeving ſervants*, & *unbeleeving wives*, & to all other *unbeleevers*, but they may, yea, & ought to apply it to their *infants**, as well as to *themſelves*, & alſo to all thoſe whom they are to eſteem in the ſtate of ſalvation; he that hath *faith* this to do is a *Chriſtian*; he that hath not ſo much *faith*, but refuſeth to apply the *Goſpel* ſo, the *Lord* be mercifull to his *ſoule!* by giving him repentance, and remiſſion of his ſinne. * See Mar. 1 1 Luk. 1. 76, 77 78, 7

All *godly parents* [like *faithfull Abraham*] were *to teach their children* the *way* of *life*, both what things were, and what things ſignified (*Gen.* 18. 17. 19. *Joſh.* 4. 21. 24.) and to declare unto them the *goodneſſe* of *God* in the *land* of the *living*; yea, to hide nothing from them, which might be *profitable* to them, or beneficiall for them. But as they grew up to be *capable* of *knowledge*, the *parents* were (as before *mentally*, ſo now) *verbally*, to apply the *promiſes* unto themſelves, and their *children*, &c. *Pſal.* 78. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. And ſurely this is one cauſe why the *Land mourns*, & why the *Lord ſmiteth the earth with curſing*, becauſe the *heart* of the *parents* are not linked to their *Inſants*. This part of good *Elias* and *John Baptiſts miniſtery*, doth not worke upon them. And how can it worke upon them ſo long as they continue in their *ſinnes*, and ſo wrap themſelves, and their *off-ſpring*, in many *miſchiefes* and *miſeries*, and doe not chooſe *life*, (the thing that *pleaſeth God*,) but refuſe it, and follow the *wayes* of the *ſtrange woman*, *whoſe wayes are wayes of death, and whoſe ſteps reach downe to hell*. Mal. 4. 5,

And ſurely, I may well ſay unto you, that thoſe are *Phyſicians* of no value, who in ſtead of *curing* them, doe *kill* them, and in ſtead of *preſerving* them, doe *poyſon*, *harden*, *corrupt*, and *pervert* them, with ſuch *damnable doctrine*, wch ſo violently poſſeſſeth them, that they thinke the *Infants* of *beleevers* have no *priviledge* at all in reſpect of the *Covenant of grace*; no more then the children of *Turkes* and *Heathens*, who are *unholy*. A dangerous doctrine! and to be abhorred, deteſted, and witneſſed againſt, by thoſe that feare the *God* of *heaven*,

and desire to make a difference between the *precious* and the *vile*, against all such *Mongrell* opposites, who by speech, and writing, (contrary to the Tenour of the whole Scripture) do labour to rank all *infants* in one *condition*! Thus coupling *light* and *darknesse*, *God* and *Belial*, the *beleever* and the *Infidell* together! But *woe unto them*, may we say, (as sayth the Prophet *Isaiah*, *Isa.* 10. 1.) *which decree unrighteous decrees, and write grievousnesse, which they have prescribed.* Thus drawing * *iniquitie with the cords of vanitie, and sinne as it were with a cart-rope. Woe* ** *unto them that call evill good, and good evill; that put darknesse for light, and light for darknesse; bitter for sweet, and sweet for bitter.*

Isa. 5. 18.
* Ver. 20.

Yet surely God is good unto Israel, (may wee say) *to those that are pure in heart. The Lord hath been mindfull of us; He will blesse us. He will blesse the house of Israell* (saith that sweet singer of *Israel*) *He will blesse the house of Aaron: He will blesse those that feare the Lord, both small and great. The Lord shall increase you more and more, you and your children. You are blessed of the Lord, who hath made the heaven and the earth.*

Psal. 73. 1.
Psal. 115. 12, 13, 14, 15.

NExt you say, *The fourth Scripture is, That which speakes of Christs commanding little Children to be brought unto him, and sayth, That of such is the kingdome of God. Hence* (you say) *therefore some reason; The kingdome of God belongeth to little Children, why not the Seales?*

See *A. R.* pag. 12. lin. 40.
pag. 13. li. 1, 2.
pag. 13. l. 3.

Ans. If by these [*some*] you mean the people of the *Seperation*; then (I say) you have not set it downe according to our expression: It is too generally laid downe; We say the *kingdome* of heaven belongeth to the *Infants* of *beleevers*: and we doe not barely question, why not the *seales*? But we set it downe affirmatively, that the *seales* doe *belong* to the *infants* of *beleeving parents*. But for as much as our poynt is particularly concerning the *Baptisme* of *infants*, I intend to proceed directly to the matter in hand; and answer your trifling objections by the way as I trace you.

Mat. 28. 19.
Mat. 16. 16.

Firſt, It is to be minded, that *Baptisme* is one of the *priviledges* of *Christs Church*, which is his *house* and *kingdome*.

Secondly, It is also to be minded, that *Jesus Christ*, the *eternall Sonne of God*, and *Lord of Glory*, and of all administrations, and giver of every good and perfect gift, when he sayth, *Suffer the little Children to come unto me, &c. For of such is the kingdome of heaven.* He doth hereby apply the *Gospel* unto them. I say, It is *Gospel*

Mar. 10. 14.
Mat. 19. 14.

which

which he speaketh here. And so wee are to understand that [with the *kingdome*] the *infants* of *believers* have the *Gospel* of the *kingdome* also appertaining unto them, together with the *privileges* thereof.

It being so, the Argument lieth thus;

Those persons to whom the *Gospel* may lawfully be applyed, to those *Baptisme* doth of right belong, and upon them it must be administred, *Mar.16. 16. Mat.28. 19.*

But the *Gospel* may lawfully be applyed to *Believers Infants*, *Isa.22. 24. Jer. 30. 20. 22. Mat.19. 13, 14. Mar.10. 13, 14, 15, 16. Luk.18. 15, 16, 17. & 19. 9, 10. Gen. 17. 7, 8. 11. 13, 14 Rev. 21. 3. & 22. 14.*

Therefore *Baptisme* doth of right belong unto them, and must be administred upon them.

The *first* and *second* part of this *Argument*, being thus expressed, and also proved by the *Scriptures*, cited for Confirmation thereof; the *Conclusion* is true and certaine; and may further appeare so to be, by what hath been said in this Treatise, (where the *poynt* hath been handled) and may be further evinced, by taking away whatsoever else you can object against the same.

And now let us heare your Answer:

First, *That if Infants have right to one of the seales* (if I may so call them) *then to both; to the Supper as well as to Baptisme.*

To which I reply, That this objection is impertinent. The *Infants* of *believers* (the Lords blessed Saints) have *right* both to *Baptisme*, and the *Lords Supper*; as the *infants* of *believers* in the time of the *Law*, had right to *Circumcision*, and the *Passeover*; and wee are to minde, that although persons were not (nor could not be *capable**) at all times to receive the *Ordinances*, yet they had *right* unto them then, and so persons now have right to those *heavenly things*, which they are not *capable* to receive; So wee know that divers *Saints* (though in yeares) have right to the *preaching* of the *Word*; yet have not *capabilitie* * (at all times) to conceive what is *taught*: Wherefore your arguing (*that if Infants have right to one of Gods Ordinances, they have right to both*) hath no weight in it against *Infants* right to *Baptisme*.

Your next words are, that

Here (they say), not to the Supper, untill they be able to examine themselves, which is required of all that receive the supper.

Answer. If by [*they*,] you mean those of the *Seperation*; And if by

[ ] Where the kingdome is, ther's the Gospel. Get the kingdome, thou hast God and Gospel, and all.

Infants Baptisme, Jure Divino.

A. R. Pag. 13. lin. 5.

Mar. 10. 14. 16 1 Cor. 7. 14.

* In respect of a *naturall capabilitie.*

* In case of deafnesse, or other defects in nature.

A. R. Lin. 8, 9.

by *infants*, you mean their *infants*; I anſwer then, that wee affirme no ſuch thing, as you would father upon us *, (that holy *infants* have no right to the *Supper*) for we know they have a *right* unto it, though they want *capabilitie* to partake of it; The *Lords ſupper* being an *active Ordinance* [there is more required then a *bare ſuffering*,] for there is *an acting* required of the partakers thereof; *Take, eate, doe this in remembrance of me* *, *&c.* But *Baptiſme*, [being a *paſſive ordinance*] the partie upon whom it is *impoſed*, is not required, [*actually*] to doe it, but onely to *ſuffer* it to be done.

So the *infants* of *beleevers* in the time of the *Law*, had *right* both to *Circumciſion*, and the *Paſſeover*; yet *Circumciſion* they might *receive*, (when they were not capable to partake of the *Paſſeover*,) becauſe that (as hath been formerly minded) there was an *activeneſſe* required of the partaker in partaking, and at adminiſtration of the *Paſſeover*, but onely a meet *ſuffering*, (by the ſubject) when *Circumciſion* was *impoſed* upon him. So that holy *infants* now are as capable to receive *Baptiſme*, as the *infants* in former time were to receive *Circumciſion*; and theſe are as *capable* to receive the *Supper* now, as thoſe *infants* were to receive the *Paſſeover* then. Wherefore ſeeing there was no reaſon to keepe thoſe *infants* from being *Circumciſed*, though they could not partake of the *Paſſeover*, (having right unto both.) Therefore there is no juſt reaſon can be given to debarre ſuch holy *infants* from *Baptiſme* now, though they cannot partake of the *Supper*; yet they have right unto *both*.

It may be you will ſay, that *all that had right to the Paſſeover, were not to be kept from it, but to partake of it at the time of adminiſtration; and that all who have right to the ſupper, are to partake of it when it is adminiſtred, &c.*

Anſ. No; not ſo; for perſons might have *juſt occaſions*, which might *juſtly* hinder them from the *Paſſeover*, and yet they had right unto the *Paſſeover*; As when they were *uncleane*, or in a *journey*, yet they had ſtill a *right* unto the *Paſſeover*, (though they were not at that time to partake of it.) And if they were driven from the *ſocietie* of the *Saints*, they had ſtill *right* unto the *ordinances*, though they could not come to enjoy them. So if perſons were *ſicke*, wee will not ſay, that the *Paſſeover* was to be infuſed in them, againſt their ſtomack; yet had they a *right* thereto, though they could not *partake* thereof.

When

* Lin. 5.

Mat. 26. 26.

* Luk. 22. 19.

The *Lords ſupper* is active, & *Baptiſme* paſſive, in reference to the receivers thereof.

When the *Children* of *Israel* were in *Ægypt*, they were commanded to eat the *Passeover*, with their loynes girded, their shooes on their feete, and their staves in their hands, and to eat it in haste, for it was the Lords *Passeover*; and though every *member* of the *Congregation*, had *right* thereto *, yet we will not say, they were to *partake* thereof, when they could not, for the causes before specified, or the like occasions. Exod. 12. 1

And as it may be said concerning comming to the *Passeover* then, so it may be said of communicating in the *Lords Supper* now, that all that have *right* thereto, are not commanded to *partake* thereof. * Exod. 12. 47

And those Saints then that could not partake of the *Passeover*, did not (and these that cannot partake of the *Supper*, doe not) sinne in not partaking thereof; and therefore these are not commanded or injoyned by *God* to partake of the *Supper* (for God requireth not impossibilities of us,) neither are we commanded (or injoyned) to administer it unto them; but *circumcision* was commanded to be administred upō & unto the other; therfore it appeareth that though they were not *capable* [*actually*] to *receive* the *Passeover*, yet seeing they were still the *Saints* of *God*, they had *right* thereunto.

And the like may be sayd concerning all the holy *infants* of the *Church* now; and concerning the *ordinances* now, which are in stead of the *ordinances* then, and in effect the same. Though the *Infants* of *Beleevers*, have *right* to the *Supper*, yet have they not *capabilitie* to *receive* it, and therefore it must not be administred unto them; but *Baptisme* [that passive *Ordinance*] may, because there is required no *actuall* doing of the *receiver*, but a *suffering*, for the *Water* in *Baptisme* is not to be *drunken* by them, nor to be *infused* into them, but *imposed* upon them.

Moreover, Concerning their not having the *Supper*, you have answered your selfe, in answering them, when you say *, That *Examination* (in respect of the *Supper*) *is required onely of men of yeares, not of infants, who are not able to performe it.* A. R. * Pag. 13. lin. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

Further you tell us, That if your *Author, nor memory faile you, Children were admitted as well to the Supper, as to Baptisme, for many yeares in time past.* (and over against in the *margent* of the *page* * you name *Parker on the Crosse.*) * Page 13. at lin. 15.

Ans. Indeed you may suspect your memory, if you take your imagination to be your memory. And you may expect, that your *Author* can stand you in little stead, in opposing the *Baptisme* of *Infants*;

A good object may faile a bad subject; and so your *Author* may faile you, especially, he being neither an *Author*, nor upholder of your errour, which you labour by all meanes to uphold.

Next you say;

A. R. l. in. 17, 18, 19 *And why not to the one as well as to the other, seeing the same reasons are alike in both, and will center into one, if fully prosecuted?*

I *Answer*, This is but a begging of the *Question*, I have told you why not to the one, as well as to the other. Because they are *capable* of the one (in respect of a *naturall capabilitie*) but not of the other. And therefore I deny that the *reasons* are alike in *both*; or will *center* into one, though [never] so fully *prosecuted*.

Pag. 13. li. 21, 22. Wheras you further oppose *infants Baptisme*, saying, that* *no Infant is required by God, in Scripture, to beleeve, or to repent, or to be Baptized by any man, &c.*

The *Infants* of *beleevers* are not *impenitent*.

I *Answer*. That this your speech is ambiguous, and abominable, and you may know, that we stand not for the *Baptizing* of *Infidells*, or those in whose hearts wee cannot rightly *judge the foundation of repentance to be layd*. For God hath not required such to be *baptized*, no more then he did command such to be *circumcised* in the time of the *Law*. And you should know, that *faith is the gift of God*; & so also is *repentance*: and though the *Saints* of *God* are not required to manifest their *faith* and *repentance actually*, so long as they cannot act; yet for to say, that therefore they have not *faith* and *repentance*, or that wee are not to *judge* them to have the *gifts* and *graces* of the *Spirit*, because they cannot act, is a meer idle toy! and *frivolous foppery*. But if you will say, that though the *infants* of *beleevers* cannot manifest *faith* and *repentance*, no more then *Isaac* could (who was a *childe* of *promise* in his *infancie*) yet they are to be *judged* to have *faith* and *repentance*, notwithstanding. Then you will agree with us in this truth. But if you will say, you deny it, and will not assent unto it, and that therefore the *infants* of *beleevers*, ought not to be *baptized*; Then I tell you, you have your answer long agoe.

In his *Centre* upon the *Anabaptists* *Dialog. pa. 70. n. 19.* Christian Infants (sayth Mr. *Ainsworth* *) *Have the* grace *they speake of* repentance, faith, regeneration, *&c. Though not* actually, *or by way of* declaration *to others*; *yet they have* (*through the worke of the* Spirit) *the* seed *and* beginning *of* faith, virtually *and by way of* inclination, *so that they are not* wholly destitute *of* faith, regeneration, *&c. though it be a thing hid, and unknowne unto us, after what manner the* Lord *worketh these in them*. Eccles. 11. 5.

Which

Which Mr. *Ainsworth* doth further prove, thus *;

If Infants naturally *are some wayes capable of* Adams sinne; *and so of* unbeliefe, disobedience, transgression, *&c. Then* Christian Infants supernaturally, *and by* grace, *are some wayes capable of* Christs righteousnesse, *and so of* faith, obedience, sanctification, *&c. But* Infants *are* capable *of the former* evills *by* Adam: *therefore they are capable of the later* good *things by* Christ.

Thus they are capable of the former, he proved (in his treating of originall sinne) from divers Scriptures, as Psal. 51. *John* 3. *Rom.* 5. *&c.* The *consequence, to wit, that* infants *are capable of the later* good *things by* Christ, *he proveth thus* *.

First, Because the first Adam *was a figure of the* second Adam, *Christ; So that as the* sinne *of the* first Adam, *his* fault, disobedience, *and* death *for it, came on all his* Children, *both by* imputation, *and* infection, *or corruption of* nature; *So the* righteousnesse *and* obedience *of* Christ, *cometh on all his* Children, *both by* imputation, *and* renewing *of* nature, *unto* life *and* salvation; *as the* Apostle *compareth them,* Rom. 5. 12. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. 21.

Secondly, Because Infants (*being* (*by* Adam) sinners, Children *of* wrath, *&c.*) *must be* borne againe *of the* Spirit, *or else they cannot see the* kingdome *of* God, *Joh.* 3. 3. 5. 6. *But the* Christian Infants, *dying in* infancie, *shall see the* kingdome *of* God, *and not be* damned, (as the Adversaries grant *) *Therefore by* Christs doctrine, *they are* borne againe *of the* Spirit: *and so must needs (in some measure) have* repentance, faith, *and* holines, *without which there is no* regeneration.

Againe, That Infants *have the* faith, *and* love *of* God *in them: And* regeneration *in their measure is thus proved; They to whom* God *giveth the* signe *and* seale *of* righteousnesse *by* faith, *and of* regeneration, *they have* faith *and* regeneration [*for* God *giveth no* lying signe, *he* sealeth *no* vaine (or *false*) Covenants.]

But God *gave to* Infants Circumcision, *which was the* signe *and* seale *of the* righteousnesse *of* faith, *and* regeneration. *Gen.* 17. 12. *Rom.* 4. 11. & 2. 28, 29. *Colos.* 2. 11.

Therefore Infants *had (and consequently now have)* faith *and* regeneration, *though not in the* crop *of* harvest *by* declaration; *yet in the* bud *and* beginnings *of all* Christian graces.

* In the sa[illegible] page, lin. 2[illegible] to page 71.

* See his boo[illegible] page 71. lin. 8[illegible]

* The *old Anabaptists* do[illegible] grant, that *childrē (dying in the[illegible] infancie)* shall see the *Kingdo[illegible]* of *God*. But some now (tha[illegible] stand against the *Baptisme* o[illegible] *Infants*) say, *They are all i[illegible] the state of damnation*; Other[illegible] (that withstand *Infants Bap[illegible]tisme*) say, They know no[illegible] how to *judge* of them; But [illegible] say, by the *Scripture*, Wee ar[illegible] to *judge* the *infants* of *belee[illegible]vers*, to be in the state of *sal[illegible]vation*, and those of them tha[illegible] die in their *infancie*, are no[illegible] *damned*, but *saved*: And as fo[illegible] other *Infants* (even the *infant[illegible]* of the *wicked*) we have nothin[illegible] to doe to *judge* them *within* [illegible] but *without*.

Th[illegible]

They that deny this reaſon, muſt either make God *the Author of a* lying ſigne, *and* ſeale *of the* Covenant *to* Abraham, *and his* Infants; *or they muſt hold, that* infants *had thoſe* graces *then, but not now; both which are* wicked *and* abſurd *to affirme; Or they muſt ſay, that* Circumciſion *was not the* ſigne *and* ſeale *of the* righteouſneſſe *of* faith, *and then they openly contradict the* Scripture, *Rom.* 4. 11.

Moreover, As the Apoſtle *in Rom.* 5. *compareth our* naturall *eſtate in* Adam, *and our* ſpirituall *eſtate in* Chriſt, *ſo may wee, in this caſe.*

If wee cannot juſtly object againſt Gods *worke in* nature, *but doe* beleeve *that our* Infants *are* [reaſonable creatures] *and are* borne [*not* bruit beaſts, *but* men] *though* actually *they can manifeſt no* reaſon, *or* underſtanding *more then* beaſts (*yea, a* young Lambe knoweth *and* diſcerneth *his* damme *ſooner then an* Infant knoweth *his* Mother;) *then neither can wee juſtly object againſt* Gods *worke in* grace, *but are to* beleeve, *that our* Infants *are* ſanctified creatures, *and are* borne beleevers, *not* Infidells, *though outwardly they can manifeſt no* faith, *or* ſanctification *unto us.*

And why ſhould it be thought incredible, that God *ſhould worke* faith *in* Infants? *If it be becauſe wee know not, or perceive not how it can be; let us conſider, that we know not the way of our* naturall birth, *and other* earthly *things,* Eccleſ. 11. 5. Joh. 3. 8. *How then can wee know* heavenly *things?*

If we make queſtion of the power *of* God; *nothing is unpoſſible with him. He made all things of nothing; He can make the* dumbe beaſt *ſpeak with* mans voyce, *Numb.* 22. *He can make the* babe [*in the* mothers wombe,] *to be* affected *and* leap *for* joy, *at the* voyce *of the* words *ſpoken to the* mother, *Luk.* 1. 44. *And can he not alſo worke* grace, faith, *and* holines *in* Infants? *Hath* Sathan power *by* ſinne, *to* infect, *and* corrupt Infants, (*as is before proved*) *and ſhall not* God *have* power *to* cleanſe *from* corruption, *and make them* holy? *If wee make doubt of the* [will] *of* God *herein, behold wee have* [*his* promiſes,] *to reſtore* [*our* loſſes] *in* Adam, *by his* graces *in* Chriſt, (*as he ſheweth in* Rom. 5.) *That he will* circumciſe *our* heart, *and the* heart *of our* ſeed *to* love *him,* Deut. 30. 6. *Wee have the* ſeale *of his* promiſe, *in giving* Circumciſion *to* Infants, *to ſignifie and* ſeale *the* righteouſneſſe *of* faith, *Rom.* 4. 11. *Gen.* 17. *And wee have* aſſurance *of all his* promiſes, *and of that to* Abraham *and his* ſeed *in* particular, *to be confirmed unto us* (*not abrogated or leſſened*) *by* Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* 1. 20. *Luk.* 1. 72, 73. *Gal.* 3. 14. *&c. Wherefore they are but a* faithleſſe *and* crooked gene-

ration,

tation, that notwithstanding all that God hath spoken and done in this kinde, doe deny this grace *of* Christ *to the* Infants *of his* people, *and the* seale, *or confirmation of this* grace *by* Baptisme *now, as it was by* Circumcision *of old.*

Next you say;

Secondly, This reason is grounded upon a great mistake of the sense of the Text; for the words are not unto them belongs the Kingdome, but of such is the Kingdome, (that is) *of none else, but of such, as the next words which follow in these Texts, doe manifestly declare; for in* Luk. 18. 17. Mar. 10. 15. *In both places, where Christ had said, Suffer little Children to come unto me, for of such is the Kingdome of God. He presently confirmes it in the next words, thus; Verily, I say unto you, whosoever shall not receive the kingdome of God as a little childe, shall not enter therein. As also in* Mat. 18. 34. *Christ speaking to his Disciples, sayth, Except yee be converted, and become as little children, yee shall not enter into the Kingdome of heaven; Whosoever therefore shall humble himselfe as this little childe, the same is the greatest in the Kingdome of heaven. Whereby it is evident, that when Christ sayth, of such is the Kingdome of heaven, his meaning is not of them, nor of such as them in age, nor understanding,* 1 Cor. 14. 20. *But of such as them in humilitie, and such like qualifications.* A. R.

Ans. If you mean heer, that the *Seperates* do *ground* their *reason* upō a great mistake, of the sense of the *Text*, in saying, that the *Kingdome* of *God* belongeth to the *Infants*, and therefore *Baptisme*. Then to your *impertinent* & *confused* answer, or *groundlesse aspersion*. I reply.

First, That it is not sufficient to say, that the *reason is grounded upon a mistake*, unlesse it be so, which if it be not so, then you are mistaken your selfe (and that greatly) both in the *reason*, and in the *sense* of the *Text* also, in charging us with a great mistake, when it is not grounded upon any mistake, much lesse upon a great mistake, and least of all upon a great mistake of the sense of the Text, as you unjustly speake; and therefore your charge is but a treble evill surmise, a meer supposition of that which is not; and this may evidently appeare to be true, because out of *Christs* owne words, wee may gather that the *Kingdome* of *heaven* belongeth to the *holy Infants*; *for*, sayth he, *of such is the Kingdome of heaven.*

Secondly, Wee doe not say, that the words are in expresse termes, unto [*them*] belongs the *Kingdome*, (you shall not father this upon us,) but *of* [*such*] *is the Kingdome of God*, and yet notwithstanding

standing the *sense* is rightly taken, according to the *Text*, that the *Kingdome of heaven* belongeth unto the *Infants*, and therefore you cannot justly charge our reason to be impertinent, or to be grounded upon any mistake at all, much lesse a mistake of the Text. So then it appeareth that the mistake is not ours, but yours; seeing you mistake your selfe, and us, and *Christ*, and all.

Thirdly, I doe not know your meaning, when you rehearse *Christs* words, *Of such is the Kingdome of heaven*, and say (*that is*) *of none else, but of such*. You should know that the *Kingdome of heaven* belongeth to those that are past *infancie*, as well as to *Infants*; *Aged persons* are of the *Kingdome of heaven* as well as such *children*. If you denie this, you will denie your own enterance into the Kingdome, or else say you are an *infans*, which thing I suppose you will not doe. But the drift of your interpretation is to prove, that when *Christ* sayth, *Of such* he meaneth *such, and none else but such* [*& therefore no Infants*] For so it appeareth by your words afterwards, when you say, *Christs meaning is* [*not of them, nor of such as them in yeares nor understanding*;] a meer non-sense conclusion; and your ground is, *Because Christ sayth* [*of such*] *and doth not say* [*of them*;] But herein you erre, and are mistaken in the word *such*; and your inferences therefrom, are not according to truth; which may appeare thus; As for Instance;

Suppose a person should come to you, and before divers persons charge you, saying, *Such persons who use such things as* you *doe, are* worthy to be *condemned*. I suppose the accusation toucheth your own particular person, as much as any other, and that so you will confesse, and take it as meant of you.

But if upon examination of the accuser, you shall find him to faulter, & say, that therefore he meant not you, nor any such thing wch you doe, &c. would you not count him a *knave*, or a *foole*, or a *lyar*?

Againe, He that should come and say, *Such an* argument *or* arguments as you bring here *are* good, *and* full *of* wildome, *and* abound *in* sense; you would hear to him patiently, and gladly, (if not fully) approve of his speech. But if he should draw a consequence from his former words, and say, that therefore (he meaneth) your arguments are evill, and full of foolishnesse, and abound with nonsence; and that in saying such arguments were good, he doth not mean that your arguments are good at all, not such as yours in such a respect, but in respect of such, or such a thing. Would not you begin to wonder at him, and to count him a *madman*? an *idiote*? a

hen *Paul*
th, *Rom.* 1.
. *Those that*
such things
e worthy of
th, he mea-
th those
ings before
cified in the
ne Chapter.

fools? or a *lyar?* or one that setteth himselfe on set purpose to *ca-vill*, or *quarrell?*

Apply this to your selfe, for even so is your owne *argument*, or objection here against *Infants*; And therefore I hope I may tell you (without giving you any occasion of offence,) that as your *vindication* unto that *person* before specified, would be, that your *Arguments* are such as those which are so answerable to *them*, that they are such, and that therefore his arguing can make nothing against your *Arguments*. So I (in answer to you) may say, that the *infants* which *Christ* tooke up in his *armes*, are the same with those who are so answerable to them, that they are such; for reason teacheth us to know, that those *infants* then in *Christs* armes are such as they then were, & not otherwise then they then were; and so now reason teacheth us, that *reasonable creatures* are as like unto themselves as those to whom they are compared, and that those to whom they are compared rightly, are not more like themselves, then themselves are like themselves, and therefore apply all this to our *present purpose*, and then wee may see the *unreasonablenesse*, and *perversenesse*, *crookednesse* and *foolishnesse*, of those who will so *wrest Christs words*, as if when he sayth, *Of such is the kingdome of heaven*, he meaneth not them, but *excludeth* them, and such as them, and onely *includeth* some others who are for *qualifications* like *them*.

And therefore now (Mr. A. R.) I challenge you, [and all that take your part in opposing *Infants*] to bring me *one instance* in all the *Scripture*, where persons are spoken of, and where it is sayd of such, that the persons with whom they are compared, & to whom such a thing is applyed, are not included or comprehended in the word, *such*, as well as those who are compared with them. In the mean time, till you shew such an instance, [which thing you can never doe] I must still rest in the mind of *Christ*, that he meaneth them as well as any, & includeth them as well as the rest, and doth not exclude them, but include them, in these words, *Suffer the little Children to come unto me, &c. for of such is the kingdome of heaven.*

Fourthly, If *Christ* had sayd, *Of* [*them*] *is the kingdome of heaven*, and had not sayd, *Of* [*such*] *is the kingdome, &c.* Then you might have had more colour, for to limit, and restraine the *Scripture* as you doe. And then you would object; thus,

Yea, It is true, Christ as he was God, knew all things, & therfore he (knowing thē to be elected) saith in particular, Of them is the kingdom, &c. But

it doth not follow, that therefore such as they are of it, and therfore we may not say, that any other beleevers infants are of the kingdome of heaven besides them. But heer you may see, that this blocketh up your *objections*, considering that *Christ* sayth, *Of [such] is the kingdome, &c.* And that the word [*such*] is of a larger extent, then the word [*them*] and includeth *them* also, as hath been observed before.

Fifthly, If the next words after (both in *Luk.* 18. and *Mar.* 10.) doe confirme the former, (as you confesse,) then it still argueth, that the reason is *invincible*, and therefore neither you, nor all the men in the world, can overthrow it. It was firme *before*, and it being (by your own *confession*) *confirmed* in the next words *after*, then it is not *contradicted* there, as you have *contradicted* it here, and therfore *judge* your selfe, whether you have not bestowed *labour in vaine*, in thus opposing *holy Infants*. For these Texts doe prove still, that as *infants* are of the *kingdome*, so they are not destitute of the *graces* of the *Spirit*, without which none are *capable* Subjects of the *Kingdome*. Wherefore heer is sufficient demonstration of *Infants conversion, humiliation, regeneration, and great estimation*, which they have with *Jesus Christ*, whose *word* is to be taken, and not refused, it being *spirit*, and *life*, and *truth*, and so directly opposed to your *erronious affirmations*, that it quite *overthroweth* your *unsound collections*, in your *violent opposition* of *holy infants*.

Sixthly, You speake *very untruly*, and doe *abuse* and *wrong* the Scripture exceedingly, by inferring from the *premises*, That when *Christ* sayth, *Of such is the kingdome of heaven*, *His meaning is not of them, nor of such as them in age nor understanding*. For *Christ* as he *speaketh of them*, so he *meaneth them*. (though he doe not shut out *aged* persons, that are in respect of *holinesse* such as those *holy infants* then were, or such as these *holy infants* now are) and he *meaneth* [*such*] *properly*, both in *yeares & understanding* as may appeare by the scope of the place, where it is sayd, that *Christ* commanded to suffer them to come unto him, and declareth the reason (namely) because they are *Subjects* of his *kingdome*; for *of such is the kingdome of heaven* (sayth he.) And when he cometh to teach a further lesson, he applyeth it also to persons of *yeares*, that they should learne to receive the *kingdome* of *heaven*, like them, and to be *converted*, and to cast away all *pride*, and to *humble themselves*. All which *graces* (the *fruits* of *regeneration*) the *Infants* of *beleevers* are not destitute of, for as much as they are *regenerated*, they have the *seed*, and beginning of all *Christian graces*, as hath been proved before.

Now, that *Christ* meaneth *these infants*, when he sayth, *of such is the kingdome*, is cleare in the *Text*, and may partly appeare unto you from the former Considerations. But for further confirmation of the *premises*, let us minde the scope of the *place*, and examine the *Scriptures* cited. In which is expressly declared.

First, That [the *Infants*] were [brought] unto *Christ*. Luk. 18. 15.

Secondly, The persons *intent* in bringing them (or the *reason* why they brought them) was, [*that Christ should put his hands on them, and pray*] Mat. 19. 13.

Thirdly, When *Jesus* saw that the *Disciples* rebuked those which brought them, *he was* [*much*] *displeased*, Mar. 10. 13. 14.

Fourthly, *And he* [*called*] *them unto him*, Luk. 18. 16.

Fifthly, Wee are diligently to observe *Christs* two-fold *charge*, given unto his *Disciples*. In these words, (1.) *Suffer the* [*little*] *children to come unto me*, (2.) [*and forbid them not.*] (Mar. 10. 14.) Mat. 19. 14.

Sixthly, Wee are heedfully to minde the *reason*, (which *Christ* rendereth for this) which is expressed in these words, [*For of such is the kingdome of God.*] Mar. 10. 14. Luk. 18. 16.

Seventhly, *Christs* addition, of confirmation of his former speech, or the use (which *Christs Disciples* should make concerning themselves) is not to be forgotten; *Verily, I say unto you, Whosoever shall not receive the kingdome of God as a little childe, he shall in no wise enter therein*, Mar. 10. 15. Luk. 18. 17.

Eighthly, Wee are to minde *Christs* act to these *Infants*; which was three-fold; (1.) [*He*] *took*] *them*] *up*] *in*] *his*] *armes*,] and (2.) [*put*] *his*] *hands*] *upon them*;] and (3.) [*Blessed them.*] Mat. 19. 15. Mar. 10. 16.

All which doth give us sufficient warrant to esteeme highly of them, and of all those who are like them in every respect. Therefore I desire you to weigh these things distinctly, and discreetly, and then, I hope, it will evidently appeare unto you, that you are mistaken in your meanings, and have done very evill, (though you meant never so well) in saying that *Christs meaning is not of them, nor of such as them in age, &c.*

For indeed, you may as well say, that those were not *Infants* whom *Christ* took up in his *armes*, and that he did not lay his *hands* upon them, not *blessed* them, nor such as them, in *age*, and *understanding*. But surely, if the *Scripture* in speaking of *such* persons,

doe not exclude the persons spoken of, then wee have no reason to exclude these *infants* here specified, but to know that *Christ Jesus*, who was once an *infant*, and like other *infants*, both in *age*, and *understanding*, he includeth the *infants*, & those like unto them both in *age* and *understanding*, when he saith, *Of such is the kingdom of heaven.*

Not aged persons like *Infants.*

Consider how that the *infants* were brought unto *Christ*; The intent of those that brought them was *good*, and their act in bringing them, was pleasing unto *God*. The truth of this may appeare, by observing the declaration of their intention, and likewise *Christs* great displeasure, or offence given by and taken at his *Disciples*, because *they rebuked those that brought them*; *He was much displeased* (sayth the *Holy Ghost* by *Mark*, Mark. 10. 13, 14.) which declareth an *aggravation* or *aggravation* of his *displeasure*: The noting of which, maketh still for clearing the case in controversie; and may serve for further satisfaction of the doubting *soule*, that by *Sathans* deceit, is apt to thinke, that this *righteous servant through his knowledge doth not justifie many Infants*, as well as others. *Christs double charge* unto his *Disciples*, that the *holy infants* should have free accesse and admittance unto him, without any let or hindrance, by any; and *Christs* forcible reason for it, (namely) *for* (or because) *of such is the kingdom of heaven*, &c. And then, *Christs acts* concerning these *infants*, [that *he took them up in his armes, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them*] doth further declare, the *strength* and *sufficiencie* of *mine*, (and the *weakenesse* and *insufficiencie* of *your*) *interpretation*.

ſa. 53. 11.

Seventhly, As without *Christs mande*, you have taken upon you to deliver *Christs meaning*, contrary to his owne *expressions*, *manifestations*, and *commissions*; so you cite 2 *Cor.* 14. 20. for confirmation of your strange restriction of *Christs declaration* concerning the *Infants*. As if *Paul* were a *Patron* of this your *fond opinion*; but I tell you, in this you are much deceived also, and doe erre (and as I in charitie judge) doe not know the Scriptures. It was no part of *Pauls* doctrine, to speake of *holy infants* as you doe, he telleth us, they are *holy**. And thus his exhortation (in 1 *Cor.* 14. 20.) maketh nothing for you against *holy infants*; for *Paul* doth not speake unto *Infants*, when he sayth, *Brethren, Be not children in understanding, howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men.* Now who knoweth not but that those *Saints*, who are capable to act, are to performe acts of *obedience* unto *God*: when those *Saints*,

2 Cor. 7. 14.

who

who are not capable to act, are not bounnd so to doe; For (as hath been declared before) *God* requireth *actuall obedience* of his *people*, [so far as they can act] & no further: and so *Pauls* speech is, not to binde us to *impossibilities*, but to teach us (who have *capabilitie*) to exercise the same, to the uttermost of our power, in searching after the mysteries of *Christ*, & in treasuring up those *divine truths*, which are taught us by his *Spirit*. And this maketh nothing against *holy Infants* being in the *Covenant*, or *kingdome*, no more then it maketh against those aged *Saints*, who (in respect of a naturall capabilitie) are like *children*, and know no more then *Infants know*, nor doe no more then *infants* doe, and yet doe as much as God requireth; and in respect of a *spirituall capabilitie*, are like those *Saints*, who are capable to act, & doe act according to the same; and yet those who want that capabilitie, whether *Christian infants*, or other *Saints*, though the graces of *Gods Spirit* doe not appeare in them, in the *blossome*, or *fruit*, yet have they still the *sap*, and *seed* of all *Christian graces* in them.

Even as a man, or childe, which hath not the *use* or *exercise* of reason, must not be judged to be an *unreasonable creature*, & wholly destitute of reason, but a *reasonable creature*: So these (*precious Saints*) before specified, though they have not the use and exercise of the *graces* of *Gods Spirit*, and cannot shew forth the same in the fruit, or outward manifestation, yet they are not to be esteemed *ungracious* (or destitute of *Gods grace*) but *gracious Saints*. And though they be in *understanding like children*, yet (in respect of their *capablenesse* of the *Spirit*) they are to be esteemed as *precious* as any men on earth, and wee are not to judge otherwise, but that they shall be *glorified*, and made equall with the *Angels*, and be the *sonnes* of *God* in *heaven*.

Now your citation of *Pauls* words (1 *Cor.* 14. 20. *Be not children in understanding, &c.* to confirme what you inferred and collected from *Christs* words concerning *Infants*,) doth imply, that you doe judge that all those who are like those *Infants in yeares* or *understanding*, are not of the *kingdome* of *heaven*. And this your interpretation bringeth in three absurdities.

First, It directly contradicteth *Christs* words which he spake concerning them, and checketh him in his actions which he did to them, upon them, and for them; and so you make the words, and actions of *Christ*, both *vaine* and *frivolous*.

Secondly, Your speech implyeth, that *Beleevers infants* are not

of the *kingdome* of *God*; and so their minoritie hindereth their *salvation*, (if they die in their *infancie*;) and this striketh at the *fundamentall principles of Gods free love* unto them in *Christ Jesus*.

Thirdly, In (implying, that none are of the *kingdome* of *heaven*, who are *like Infants* in *understanding*,) Here I thinke you bring in a heavie censure against your selfe; for (I suppose) as you know not how soone your *life* shall be taken from you, the like you may say for your *understanding*; and when your *understanding* is taken away (which may be done, and yet you may live many yeares after) how doe you differ in *understanding* then from a *childe*; Surely you are then in understanding like a *childe*, little *babe*, or *infant*; and how then (by your owne *exposition*) will you answer the *Apostle*, *Be not children in understanding*; Surely at the time when you will want both *will*, *skill*, and *abilitie* to *act* any more then they, what are you differing from them, and wherein will your understanding exceed theirs?

Surely in consideration of these things, you will grant, that old men, and others, that are the *true Saints* of *God*, may be *like children* [in understanding] and yet not breake their *Covenant*. And in this declining or declined condition, an *aged Saint* may (in this respect) be sayd to be as destitute of *understanding*, as the *youngest babe* of a *beleeving parent*. And he may be sayd to be still *capable* of the *Spirit* (without being brought in any other *covenant* then he was in *before*) though he be not *capable* to [doe] any *spirituall* action, by way of manifestation, but *God* must doe all in him.

Now though there be no difference between these two, in respect of *spiritualitie*, yet in some respects there is a difference; The *Infant* is [in nature] growing upwards, or in an inclining *condition*, & hath the *seed* of *Christian graces* in him; the *aged Saint* before specified, is in a declining condition; the *leaves* of the *tree* are *fallen*, no *fruit* appeareth, yet the *spirituall sap* remaineth, &c. And the consideration of this doth teach us, not to despise any of the *Lords hoffelt*, either the *Infants* for their minoritie, or the old men for their *antiquitie*, or the middle-aged for their *bodily imbecilitie*, but to esteem of them as they are, (according as the *blessed spirit* of *God* doth teach us, in his *sacred Word*) though through *imperfection*, or *defection* of *naturall abilitie*, they cannot *actually* and *verbally manifest* the *fruits* of their *sanctification*, but are even as *Children* [in *understanding*.]

By this glimpſe, you may ſee, that the *Apoſtles* words (in 1 *Cor.* 14. 20. when he exhorteth us, *Not to be children in underſtanding*) will not beare out your *childiſh conſtruction* of the words of *Chriſt*, whereby you would have us judge that he excluded *infants*; All which is evill in you ſo to think, much more to ſpeake, and worſt of all, in that you would boulſter up your opinions by *Pauls* words, in 1 *Cor.* 14. 20! Which maketh nothing at all for your preſent purpoſe, in your *reſtriction* and *miſ-application* of *Chriſts* words, where you thinke (through the help of *Paul* (1 *Cor.* 14. 20.) to get ſome advantage, or plea, to keep back the *holy infants* of *beleevers* from the *ſpirituall bleſſings*, which *Chriſt Jeſus* hath teſtified appertaineth unto them, which you thinke did not appertaine to *thoſe Infants*, which *Chriſt took up in his armes, and layd his hands upon, and bleſſed*; And why doe you thus conceive? Becauſe it is ſayd of [*ſuch*] & not of [*them.*] But this word *ſuch*, will evidently appear, (being duly weighed by the Scripture) to be of a *larger* extent then the word *them*, and ſo to include all *them*, eſpecially, conſidering that in all thoſe places of Scripture where the word *ſuch* is uſed, there is no exemption, either of the thing to which *ſuch* is *equalized*, or coupled; for *ſuch* implyeth the ſame in *nature*, and *condition*, &c.

So when *Paul* writeth to *Philemon* (*Philem.* 9, 10.) concerning *Oneſimus*, he ſayth, *Yet for loves ſake I rather beſeech thee, being* [*ſuch a one as Paul the aged.*] He meaneth himſelfe: and when *John* ſayth, *Bleſſed and happie is he that hath part in the firſt reſurrection; for on ſuch the ſecond death ſhall have no power, &c.* He meaneth by [*ſuch*] thoſe perſons who have part in the *firſt reſurrection*. The word [*ſuch.*] being a *generall* word, includeth them all. And when *Nehemiah* ſayth, (*Nehe.* 6. 11.) *Should* [*ſuch*] *a man as I flye*; He meaneth himſelfe as much as any other man. Rev. 20. 6

And ſo when *David* ſayth, *Pſal.* 103. 17, 18. *The mercy of the Lord is from everlaſting to everlaſting, upon them that feare him, and his righteouſneſſe unto childrens children* [*unto ſuch as keep his Covenant*] He meaneth thoſe that keep his *Covenant*, for this mercy was promiſed to *Abraham*, and his *ſeed*, who were to *keep* his *covenant*, by *doing* his *commands*. So *God* ſaid to *Abraham*, *Thou ſhalt keep my Covenant*, [*Therefore*] *thou and thy ſeed, &c.* And the keeping Gen. 17.

ing of his *Covenant*, consisted then, and consisteth now in the *Saints* yeelding all *obedience* unto him, according to their *capabilitie*. And thus it appeareth that when *David* sayth to [*such*] as keep his *Covenant*, he meaneth all [those] that keep his *Covenant*.

Divers other *testimonies* of *Scripture* concerning *persons* and *things*, where this word *such* is mentioned, might be produced, wch doth still include, both the former & the later, in the specification thereof, But this may suffice, for *in the mouth of two or three witnesses every thing is established*. This still giveth us more ground to beleeve that when *Christ* in his *Gospel* sayth (concerning *infants*) *of such is the kingdome, &c.* He meaneth those who are *such* in every respect; and as it is contrary to reason, so it is contrary to the *Scripture*, to thinke that the *infants* in his speech were not implyed & included, if not principally intended.

Lastly, Whereas you say, it is meant *of such as them in humilitie, and such like qualifications*; I know not from what conception you ground your speech, if not from this consideration, that the *infants* mentioned heer (in *Christs Gospel*) have *humilitie, and such like qualifications*; You should know, that although *like, is not* alwayes *the same, yet the same is the same*, & is as like unto it selfe, as that wch is like it in every respect, and therfore *Christs* speech of *Infants*, (when he sayth, *Of such is the kingdome, &c.*) implyeth the *infants* [as well as other Saints, who are like them in understanding, though they differ in yeares.] I say, Christs speech is not bound up from them, nor from any other Saints, though they are like them in every respect. And if they have *humilitie*, (according to your own grant) then you may know also that God will not reject them. He hath promised to *give grace to the humble* (Jam. 4. 6.) *To save them* (Job 22. 29.) *To uphold them*, (Pro. 29. 23.) *And to dwell in them*, (Isa. 57. 15.) and *sanctifie* them, and *renovate* them by his *Spirit*. And seeing they have *humilitie*, *Christ* is in them and they in *him*, and therefore they are *new creatures*; and the * *holinesse* which accompanieth them (by your own grant) giveth them right to *Baptisme*. And these *new creatures* have *new created spirits*, to whom is united the *Spirit* of the *Creator* *, and (*Christ* by him) *quickneth whom he will*, Joh. 5. 21. which *Spirit maketh intercession* for them, when they cannot *intercede* for themselves.

2 Cor. 5. 17.

ent. 30. 6.

Isa. 44. 3.

All which priviledges the *infants* of *beleevers* have, and though they cannot manifest the same actually, yet we may conclude that

eternall

eternall life is theirs, and the *second death shall have no power over them*; * *they are blessed and happie, having part in the first resurrection*; for *theirs is the kingdome of heaven*; and therefore it appeareth that they are given for an heritage unto *Jesus Christ*, who is the *way*, and the *truth*, the *resurrection*, and the *life*, and their *Physician*, the *graces* of whose *good Spirit*, which is infused in them, they cannot be said to *refuse*, or to *reject* his *kingdome*, or any of those *good things*, which are distributed unto them. And if the *kingdome* of *heaven* should not appertaine unto the *infants* of *beleeving parents*, as it hath done heretofore, then the *Scripture* is not fulfilled, which sayth, that *their children shall be as aforetime*; but the Scripture is true, as *God* himselfe is true, and therefore your words cannot be *true*. God took the *infants* of *beleevers* into *covenant* with him formerly, and admitted them to be *members* of his *visible Church* then, and he caused a *visible signe*, and *seale*, of his *covenant*, & his *righteousnesse* of *faith* to be *imposed* upon *them then*, and he declared from time to time his deare love, and his tender affection wch he had towards them, and therefore they are as holy as they were, and shall be as holy as they are. *Christ* is a *father* * unto the *beleeving Gentiles*, as he was unto the *beleeving Jewes*; and he is *the same yesterday, and to day, and for ever*; And therefore as the *infants* of *beleeving Jewes* & *Gentiles* were *received* with their *beleeving parents* into the *Church* of *God* in former time; So the *infants* of the *beleeving Jewes* and *Gentiles*, are received with their *beleeving parents* into the *Church* of *God* now; and as the other had *Circumcision*, so these are to have *Baptisme*, it being given to all the members of *Christs visible Church*, amongst whom they are a part. And this is according to what is written in the *Scripture* of *God*; for thus sayth the *Lord*, *Their children shall be as aforetime, and their Congregation shall be established before me, &c.* Jer. 30. 20.

* Rev. 20. 6.

* Gen. 17. 11.
* Rom. 4. 11.

* 2 Cor. 6. 18.

* Gen. 17.
* Exod. 12. 48.

* Mat. 28. 19.
* Mar. 10. 14.

Wherefore now let us see who can give one instance, or tittle of *Scripture*, for the dismission of their *membership*, or for barring them from any *spirituall priviledge* (now under the *Gospel*) which they are capable off, and in particular this of *Baptisme*, seeing it is so *generally* distributed by the Lord of all administrations, and appertaineth to all *Saints*. Indeed if *Christ Jesus* had not been much * *displeased* with his *Disciples* for such a thing, and if he had not declared that the *kingdome* of *heaven* appertaineth to them, and had not given a command, that they should be admitted unto him, or if he had not taken *them up in his armes, and layd his hands upon them, and blessed them*, *

* Mar. 10. 14.

* Ver. 16.

but

but had *despised* these, and put them from him, and justified his *Disciples* in their rebuking of them, or if he had given the *bringers* of them a check, as he did to the *Canaanitish woman*; or if he had given the least touch of *holy Infants Supplantation*, then you might have had some matter to work upon in this your *sacrilegious opposition* of *holy infants*. But you have no tittle of *Scripture* to beare you out, all the *Scripture* from the beginning of *Genesis* to the end of the *Revelation*, maketh against you; and therefore wee may conclude against you, that the *Infants* of *beleevers* are, (now, as the *Infants* of *beleevers* were, in former time,) even *subjects of Gods kingdome*[a], *members of his Church*[b], *glorious branches*, *young sucking-sprigs of his noble Vine*[c], *holy plants*[d] proceeding from those *Olive trees*, which are *planted in the house of the Lord*, and are said to *flourish in the Courts of our God*[e]; And what man shall root them out, without rooting out himselfe: Jesus hath honoured them greatly, and *what shall be done unto those whom the King of heaven delighteth to honour?* That the *Lord Jesus Christ* greatly delighteth to *honour* the *Infants* of *beleevers*, is apparently seen in these Scriptures, where *Christ Jesus* [now in the time of the *Gospel*] honoureth them so much by his words and actions. And this is that which that *heavenly Prophet Isaiah* (being *carried by the holy Spirit of God*) spake of long before, Our *God, that Father of mercies, and God of all comfort and consolation*, declared *prophetically* and *oraculously*, by *Isaiah*, the *continuation* of *his truth* unto *beleevers*, and their *Infants*, now under the *Gospel*; propheſying of *Christ* and of *Christians*, thus; *He shall be a father to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah; And the key of the house of David will I lay upon his shoulder, so he shall open, and none shall shut, and he shall shut, and none shall open; And I will fasten him as a naile in a sure place. And he shall be for a glorious throne unto his fathers house. And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his fathers house, the offspring and the issue, all vessels of small quantitie, from the vessels of cups, even to all the vessels of flagons.* Isa. 22. 21, 22, 23, 24.

First, It is here to be observed, that *Christ Jesus* is called here a *Father*, ver. 21. *He shall be a Father*, (sayth he.) So [in *Isa.* 9. 6.] he is called *the everlasting Father*. Now he that is a *father*, must be a *father* allwayes, so whereas he is called an *everlasting father*, it sheweth that he is (as the *Apostle* sayth) *the same yesterday, to day, & for ever*[f].

Secondly, It is declared, to whom he is a *father* (namely) *to the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to the house of Judah*. Now the *Inhabitants*

and

[a] Luke 18. 16.
[b] Gen. 17.
[c] Psal. 80. 11.
[d] & 128. 3.
[e] & 92. 13.

Mat. 18. 2, 3. & 19. 13, 14, 15. Mar. 10. 13, 14, 15, 16. Luk. 18. 15, 16, 17.

Isa. 22. 21. 22. 23. 24.

Heb. 13. 8.

hants of Jerusalem, and the *house of Judah*, were the *Lords Saints*, in *covenant* with him, his *Church* and *people*, of whom he had declared that *Christ Jesus* their *Saviour* should come; and these, *Christ Jesus* was said to be a *father* unto, even to the *Church* of the *Jewes*, both *young* and *old*, *parents* and *children*; and *salvation* was said to be of the *Jewes*: Their advantage was much every manner of way, first, because the *Oracles* of *God* were (through *Christ*) committed unto the; The *God* of their *fathers* was their *father*, and was as a *nursing father* unto them; And the same *God* is a *father* now unto the *beleeving Jewes* and *Gentiles*, as largely every way as he was then; *The same God over all, was, and is, rich unto all that call upon him*; And though *some doe not beleeve, it maketh not the faith of God of none effect*, no more then the *infidelitie* of some persons then, for God was still *good unto Israel*, [to his *faithfull Jewes & Proselytes*] that were *of an upright heart*, and so he is now.

a Joh. 4. 22.
b Rom. 3. 1, 2.
c Exod. 14. 2.
d Jer. 31. 9.
e Num. 11, 12.
f 1 Cor. 6. 18.
g Psal. 86. 5.
h Rom. 10. 12.

Thirdly, It is said, *And the key of the house of David, will I lay upon his shoulder, so he shall open, and none shall shut, and he shall shut, and none shall open.* And the very same with this, is applyed unto *Christ Jesus*, as is mentioned, in *Rev.* 3. 7. *These things saith he that is holy, he that is true, he that hath the key of David, that openeth, and no man shutteth, and shutteth, and no man openeth, &c.* Thus through his *knowledge* this *righteous servant* is made able to *justifie many*; to open to whom he will, and to shut out whom he will; but he shutteth not out the *infants* of *beleevers*; for he declared, *Of such is the kingdome of God.*

Isa. 22. ver. 22. & 53. 11.

Fourthly, He sayth, *I will fasten him as a nayle in a sure place*; Note here, he is said to be *fastned* as a *nayle* in a *sure place*; [A *nayle* in a *sure place*, is such a thing, upon which other things have *dependance*, so that if the *nayle* fall, all those things fall which are upon it; But if the *nayle* be sure, all those *things* which *hang* thereon, are *still* upheld by the *strength* thereof. Now the *Lord Jesus Christ* is this *nayle*, and he is *strong*, and *powerfull*, he is *perfect*, and *pure*, no *sinne* or *brittlenesse*, was found in him, he was capable to *beare* the *burden* that was put upon him, and able to beare it. Yea, and much more doth it appeare, in that he is fastned as a *nayle* in a sure* place, his *humanitie* is in *heaven*, and there it is seated and united with his *divinitie*, and there is his place of rest, and abiding, he is at the right hand of *God*, bearing us, and yet thinketh not himselfe over-burdened; he is able to beare, and doth beare all his *holy vessels*, both

* The *safenes* of *holy infants* consisteth in the *sureties* of *Jesus Christ*; Hee is unto *them*, as the *sure place* is unto *him*; whose *choyse burden* shall not be taken downe, till the *time* appointed of the *Father*,

great, and *small*; even the *off-spring*, and the *issue*, the *vessels* of *small quantitie*; so that it is as possible to pluck *God* out of *heaven*, as to take away his former favours, which he hath extended (and doth extend) towards the *faithfull*, and their *seed*; * *As for me, this is my Covenant which I will make with them, saith the Lord, the spirit, that is upon thee, and the words, that I have put in thy mouth, shall not depart out of [Thy mouth] nor out of the mouth of [thy seed] nor out of the mouth of [thy seeds seed,] saith the Lord, from henceforth and for ever.*

* Isa. 59. 21.

Fifthly; It is said; *And he shall be for [a glorious throne] unto his fathers house*; that is, a *resting place*, and a *place of Judgement**, & *Justice, Righteousnesse is the girdle of his loynes, and faithfulnesse, the girdle of his reines**. And this is *Christ Jesus our Lord*, who doth all things by his own power, & resteth not upon any humane thing, but only upon his own *divinitie*, in whose *name* we ought to doe all which we doe; and he hath promised, upon the same, to be in the *middest* of us, to ratifie those divine actions, which proceed from our sincere affections; And as he hath promised the *tree* of *life** and *hidden Manna**, and *morning starre**, (even his own *selfe**) unto us, so hath he promised to grant us to sit with him in his *throne**.

* Psal. 122. 5.
* Isa. 11. 4.
Mat. 18. 20.
* Rev. 2. 7.
* 17.
* 28.
* 24. 16.
* & 3. 21.

Now he is not sayd to be for a *glorious throne* unto any, but unto his *fathers house*; there is this *glorious throne* set in the *middest* of this heavenly Regiment, in the *middest* of his *Temple*, there is *Jesus* as a throne or seate; yea, further in the *middest of the throne*, *and round about the throne, there are* also *the foure animalls* (said to be) *which are full of eyes before and behinde, and rest not neither day nor night, crying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God Almightie, which was, and is, and is to come.*

Revel. 4. 6. 8.

Sixthly; It is sayd further; *And they shall hang upon him all the glory of his fathers house*; Here is a *weightie sentence*, *full* of *substance*. This *glorious throne*, and *holy nayle*, which is *fastned* so *surely*, is done for no *sleight* intent, but it is for *great purpose*, (namely) to beare *all the glorie of his fathers house*: It is his *fathers pleasure* to exercise him, in bearing *our glory*, which is *his glory*, *our brightnesse*, which is *his brightnesse*; (for indeed wee have no *comelinesse* but from him, and we cannot beare our selves, but he must beare us,) wee are the burden, and he is our upholder; he dependeth upon that which will not faile him, and we depend upon him, which will not faile us.

Isa. 22. ver. 24.

And this *Angelicall patron*, hath taught the *Inhabitants* of *Jerusalem*, and the house of *Judah*, (even his *Church*) to *fasten* upon him, *all the glory of his fathers house*. It is then an Ordinance from heaven, that

we

we shall so do, as he hath sayd: And this institution therefore being not of man, but of *God*, it will stand, and it being an injunction laid upon us all, that wee must (both young and old) have *dependencie* upon this *nayle*, even the *Lord Jesus*, wee must doe so. Now if wee take this word [*shall*] *prophetically*, it being also a *declaration* of what should happē (though it now be partly historicall to us) we may still see the fulfilling of it, in *Mat.* 19. 13. *Mar.* 10. 13. *Luk.* 18. 15. where *the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, and the house of Judah* brought their *children* unto *Christ*, and he took them up and bare them in his *armes*; A reall signe of his love unto them indeed; And his *Saints* now doe esteem their *Infants*, *blessed* in *Jesus Christ*, and doe *depend* upon him, that he will *circumcise* their *hearts*, and the *heart* of their *seed*, (to love him more and more,) according to his gracious promise; Deut. 30. And this is that which this *Prophetical* and *Documentall* sentence teacheth us, when it sayth, *They shall hang* (or cause to relie, or depend) *upon him, all the glorie of his fathers house*; The least glorie must not be left out, but all must be brought in, and layd upon him. He is the *object*, upon whom they must fix their *eyes*; He is the *nayle*, upon which they must *fasten* them; for so is his *Command*, *Suffer* Mar. 10. 14. *the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdome of God.* As if he should say; *They are the* burden *which I must beare, because they are part of the* furniture *of my* fathers kingdome. And *those whom the father giveth me, I will not cast away. It is not the will of your heavenly father, that any of these little ones should perish**. They are *Israelites*, the *lambs* of my *pasture*, & I am the *Shepheard* of *Israel*, and will in no wise cast them away. He sayd, *Surely they are my people, children that will not lie*, so he was their Saviour; *In all their affliction he was afflicted*; *And as I* (being *the Angel of Gods presence*) *saved them, and in my love and in my pittie redeemed them, and bare them up in mine armes all the dayes of old, so will I beare them now*; *Therefore, suffer the little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdome of God.*

* Mat. 18.
Joh. 10. 1
Isa. 63. 8,

Wherefore let all those who oppose holy *infants* know, that they thus far, are enemies unto the *Gospel*, and so doe sinne against *God* exceedingly, in labouring to cast out these who are the *glorie* of our *fathers house*. But the *holy Prophet Isaiah* sayth, that *upon all the glorie, there shall be a covering* *. Now *Infants* being part of the *glorie*, there is a *covering* upon them, and this *covering*, is by the *Spirit* of the *Lord*, for verification whereof, see the *Evangel. Mat.* 19. 14. *

* Isa. 4. 5.
59. 2
* Luk. 18. 1

where *Christ* sayth, *Of such is the kingdome of heaven*, (Mark. 10. 14. *Of such is the kingdome of God.*) *And he tooke them up in his armes, and put his hands upon them, and blessed them*, (Ver. 15.) And by this it may appeare, that all *believing parents* have ground to cast their *infants* upon the *Lord Jesus Christ*, and for them to depend upon him, who is *as a nayle fastened in a sure place.*

And whereas it is sayd, [*All the glorie,*] Wee are taught not to leave out any of the *glorie*, least by abridging (or debarring) *our Infants* of their *priviledges*, wee leave out some of the *glorie*, (if not the chiefest part) and so highly disobey *Gods Institution*, in leaving out his ordinances, and his people, which are the *glory* of his *house*. And it is to be minded, that this word [*all*] is agreeable to the words of *Christ*, when he sayth, *Of such is the kingdome of heaven*; for this word [*such,*] (as hath been observed *) is of a *large* extent, and includeth them also, they being the *glory* of the *Fathers house*; So in *Malachy*, the seed of the godly are called, *a godly seed*, Mal. 2. 14. and in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. they are tearmed *holy children*. *God* greatly delighteth in them, and they are a *glorie* unto his Church; Wherefore they are *dignified* with names accordingly.

* See before in pag. 92, 93. 99. 100.

And moreover, *Christ* being set forth as a *nayle* unto these holy *vessells*, it doth signifie unto us, that these must be put upon him which have not a *naturall capableness*, the *holy off-spring*, *and blessed issue*, the *vessells* in *Gods temple* must be *fastened* upon* him by *others.*

* Not but that they are of the *Temple*, or *members* of the *Church*, but for more *comelines*, & *honour*, and *eminencie*, *safetie*, *glorie*, and *dignitie*, they were appointed to be set on high (by the *Inhabitants of Jerusalem*, & the *house of Judah*) upō him, who is as a *nayle fastened in a sure place.* Heb. 3. 3.

If we compare the 17th of *Genesis* with this, it will give light to the poynt; for there the *parents* were *commanded* to *circumcise* their *children*, which was unto them a *signe* and *seale* of the *righteousnesse of the same faith which Abraham had*, and so it was a token that they belonged unto the *Lord*. And *Baptisme* [being unto us as *Circumcision* was unto them,] wee therefore *baptize* our *infants*, as they *circumcized* theirs; and thereby doe confirme them unto *Christ*, as they confirmed theirs. And because he claimeth these *holy vessells of small quantitie*, we therefore dedicate them unto him, according as *God* commanded the *Children* of *Israel* concerning theirs, and so we put them upon the *Lord Jesus Christ*; and they are his peculiar treasure, and he beareth them, and approveth of our *practise* in bringing them unto him, it being according to his *Commandement*, who is as *faithfull* in his *house* as *Moses*, and *is worthy of more glory then Moses**, *inasmuch as he who buildeth the house, is worthy of more honour then*

the

the house. Now in this *house*, there the *Lord* hath ordained his *vessels of small quantitie* to abide, who are the *off-spring, and the issue*, and the *glorie* thereof. And they may well be called so, for God calleth and counteth them so. And also where this *glorie* is, there is still *hope*, and it is, and may (in reason) be expected, that as they come to be capable, so they will manifest *actually* the *fruits* of *Gods Spirit*; and as they are *children* of *light*, and *inlightned*, so they will set it forth, to the *glory* of the *father* of *lights*; And as *glorious starres* in *eminencie*, shew forth their *excellencie*, in the bright *firmament* of that *heavenly Jerusalem*, wherein they are *planted*, and *placed*, and will be also a meanes to encrease it, not onely by *grafting* in *those farre remote*, but also by *propagation*, (or *multiplication*) of persons within themselves. As *Moses* (that good *Christian*, who was like unto *Christ*) sayth, *The Lord make you a thousand times so many as you be*. Which speech is not to be limited to an addition of persons, unto them from out of the world, but it is meant that they should increase amongst themselves, and so *multiply*; even as a *tree*, which (though it have *grafts*) yet *groweth* into *many branches*; which *branches* are not *grafted* in, but spring *therefrom*, and grow *thereupon*. Now where this *glorie* is not, there is a want of it, yea, and a great want, I may say indeed! And why? Because that the *Church* then is (in expectation, according to the ordinarie course of nature) in a decaying condition. I say, the *Church* is readie to decay, that is to say, to be *lessened* more, and more, in this *terrestriall habitacle*; for *it is appointed unto men once to die*, and when they are *dead*, they are gone, and leave the remnant, or none behind them. Deut. 1. 11

But *holy infants* being in the *Church*, and *members* of the same, they are a *glory* unto it, and it may well be expected, (according to the ordinary course of nature) that they will out-live the other, and so succeed them after their decease, and so the *celestiall glorie* of the *fathers* will shine in the *children*, (according to the minde of *God*) in this *terrestriall World*.

Now where this *glorie* is missing, (so that the generations in the *Church* doe passe away, and none are borne to succeed,) there is a want in that respect, and so consequently, the supply thereof is to be desired; which if it be made up, then it is a *glory*, an *honour*, a *rejoycing* unto them. So that though this *hope deferred, maketh the heart sicke*, yet *the desire* comming *is as a tree of life*, a reviving unto them. Pro. 13. 12

Look upon the first *Church* that was on earth, *Adam* and *Eve*, see whether they were not comforted in bringing forth *children* to *God*; and what hope had they of the continuance of the *Church* on earth, if it were not by *promulgation* of *children* to their *celestiall Father*. After *Abel* was slain, and *Cain* cast out, *God* sent *Seth*, in stead of *Abel*; and this thing *Eve* did acknowledge, and this was a great comfort unto them. And thus *Eve*, the mother of us all, was like unto *Rachel* and *Leah*, who built the *house of Israel*. And how was this? Even by bringing forth a *holy seed* unto *God*, and bringing them up in his feare. And this made all the *People*, and the *Elders* of *Israel*, to say unto *Boze* (upon his wedding day;) *The Lord make the woman that is come into thine house, like Rachel, and like Leah, which two did build the house of Israel*: *And doe thou worthily in Ephratah, and be famous in Bethlem. And let thy house be like the house of Pharez (whom Tamar bare unto Judah) of the [seed] which the Lord shall give thee of this young woman.*

Gen. 4. 25, 26.

Ruth 4. 11, 12.

Note here, that the *holy seed*, the *off-spring*, & the *issue*, are *materialls* for *building* the *Lords house*, they are the *comfort* of *Israel*, & the *glorie* of *Gods holy house*, and *kingdome*. But where there is no *off-spring*, no *issue*, then there is not that joy, that *gladnesse*, that *glory*, that *expectation* of *successi'on*, as would be, if there were *children*. Wherefore the *Lord* for *comforting* his *people Israel*, sayth in the 29th of *Isaiah*, ver. 22, 23. *Thus sayth the Lord, who redeemed Abraham, concerning the house of Jacob; Jacob shall not now be ashamed, neither shall his face now wax pale.* Ver. 23. *But when he seeth his children, the work of mine hands in the middest of him, they shall sanctifie my Name, and sanctifie the holy One of Jacob, and shall feare the God of Israel.* Ver. 24. *They also that erred in spirit, shall come to understanding, and they that murmured, shall learne doctrine.* And in the 30th Chapter of *Jeremiah*, Ver. 20. *God sayth, their children shall be as aforetime, and their Congregation shall be established before me, &c.* And in the 31. Chapter of *Jeremiah*, Ver. 15, 16, 17. Thus sayth the Lord, (to *Rahel*, which wept for her *children* (from two years old and under, ((*Mat.* 2. 16, 17, 18.)) and refused to be comforted, because they were not) *Refraine thy voyce from weeping, and thine eyes from teares: for thy Work shall be rewarded, sayth the Lord, and they shall come againe from the land of the enemie.* Ver. 17. *And there is hope in thine end, sayth the Lord, that thy children shall come againe unto their own border.*

Isa. 29. 22, 23.

Jer. 30. 20.

Jer. 31. 15, 16, 17.

Take notice heer, how the *Lord* comforted his *people*, and spake

comfortably to *Jerusalem*; And he is the same unto his *people*, as he hath been heretofore: His *comfort* is not lessened, but is extended to all *Saints*, from the *least* unto the *greatest*, from the *youngest* to the *eldest*. God never lesseneth his *glorie*, not his *excellencie*, wch he communicateth to his *people*, but daily increaseth his *blessings*, and multiplieth his *benefits* towards them and theirs, and increaseth their *glory*, & doth not, nor never did, diminish it from them, or their *infants*. And therefore experience teacheth us, that the *infants* of the *Saints*, are the *glory* of the *fathers house*, as heretofore they have bin. Psal. 68. 19.

Seeing then it is so cleare, that the *infants* of *beleevers* are the *glory of the fathers house*, they (being of his *houshold*) must have the *privilages* of the *house*, according to the appointment of the *houshold-order*; and what is appointed for such *vessells* of *honour*, and of *glory*? Surely these *holy vessells* of the *Lords sanctuary*, they being *beleevers*, and *Disciples* of *Christ*, being *hallowed* by the *holy Ghost*, ought to be *baptized*; See *Mat.* 28. 19. *Mark.* 16. 16.

Seventhly, It is declared, what this *glory* is, and wherein this *glory* consisteth, or what must be put upon *Christ*, what *glorious things*, even *the off-spring, and the issue*, (sayth he) that is to say, their *seed*, or *children*; for they are the *off-spring*, and the *issue*, as may appeare by these Scriptures; [*Job* 5. 25. *Isa.* 21. 8. & 48. 19. & 61. 9. & 65. 23. *Gen.* 48. 5, 6.] And this is according to what the *Apostle* declareth in 1 *Cor.* 7. 14. that the *children* of *beleevers*, (*male*, or *female*,) the *off-spring*, and the *issue*, are a *holy seed*.

Now this *off-spring*, and *issue*, hath dependency upon *Jesus Christ*, and he beareth them, and will beare them, and *blesse* them in bearing them, and *justifie* them in *blessing* them, and *sanctifie* them in *justifying* them, and *glorifie* them in *sanctifying* them; He is all in all, in them, and for them, and to them; Their *glory*, is the *glory* of his *Fathers house*, and they are the *glory* thereof, as hath been shewed before. Wherefore let all *Christian parents*, as they love *Christ*, in *procreation* of their *children*, dedicate their *holy off-spring*, and *blessed issue*, unto *God*, and lay them upon the *Lord Jesus Christ*, and say unto him, *Save us thy people*, (both *great* & *small*,) and *blesse thine inheritance, gather them, and lift them up for ever*. Rom. 8. 30. Psal. 28. 9.

Eighthly, Further, this *holy off-spring, and blessed issue*, which is the *glory* of the *house* of the *God* of all *glory* and *power*, (who is the *Father* of our *Lord Jesus Christ*) are called *vessells* of *small quantitie*, *vessells* of *small quantie*, are used to be set upon *nayles* sometimes for

show,

ſhow, for ſafetie and conveniencie, glory and decency. Now *Jeſus Chriſt* is as a *nayle*, *the off-ſpring*, *and the iſſue*, are the *veſſells of ſmall quantitie*, and theſe *holy veſſells* of *ſmall quantitie*, *Jeſus Chriſt* is ſaid to *beare*; yea, and to beate them *all*, [*all*] *veſſells of ſmall quantitie*, (ſayth the Text.) Wherefore wee have no ground to caſt away any of them, or omit the leaſt of theſe *veſſells*, though they are but of [*ſmall*] *quantitie*.

Some peradventure will think, that *becauſe the infants of beleevers are veſſells of* [*ſmall*] *quantitie*, that *therefore they are* [*no veſſells*,] *or veſſels of* [*no*] *quantitie*, or veſſels of contempt, or diſgrace, or ſuch in whom there is no *glory ſpiritually*, or ſuch concerning whom they cannot *judge*, or ſuch in whom the *ſeed* of *Gods grace* is not to be eſteemed to be. But let them know, that they doe *violent injurie* unto *Jeſus Chriſt*, and doe exceedingly eclipſe the *glorie* of his *Mediatorſhip*; For as the *ſmalleſt veſſells* in the *Lords Temple*, in the time of the *Law*, were as *holy* as the *greater*, though they could not containe ſo much; So the *Infants* of *beleevers*, (who are the *Lords veſſells*) are as *holy*, as thoſe *Saints* who are paſt their minoritie, though they being *Infants*, through tendernes of yeares, cannot containe, or receive, what the others (who are aged) can; yet are they as precious in *Chriſts* eſtimation, and have his *holineſſe* upon them, as aged Saints have. There was a great difference*, in the time of the *Law*, between the *ſpoones*, *flaggons*, and *cups*, in the *Temple*; and the *cenſers*, *ſeas*, and *potts*: and yet they were all holy, both *great* and *ſmall*: and ſo were the *Jewes*, both *young* and *old*, *great* and *ſmall*, *Infants* and *aged perſons* they were all *holy* eccleſiaſtically, and all the *Lords holy veſſels*; and we are not to have ſuch *ſacrilegious* thoughts, as to thinke *God* doth refuſe the *infants* of *beleevers*, though they are *veſſells* of *ſmall quantitie*.

The *Boules* before the *Altar* were counted very *glorious*, when it is taken for ſuch an excellent thing, for the *potts* in the *Lords houſe*, to be like unto them. If then the *potts* in the *Lords houſe*, ſpiritually are (in theſe laſt dayes, and flouriſhing times of the Goſpell*) *like the boules before the Altar*; What are the *boules* before the *Altar*? What are the *cups*? What are the *flaggons*? The *Lord* in numbering up his *holy veſſells* of *ſmall quantitie*, [even the *holy off-ſpring*, and the *bleſſed iſſue*,] calleth them by the name of *cups* and *flaggons*, and calleth them *the glory of his houſe*. All which doth ſet forth the *excellency* of the *Infants* of *beleevers*, their *great holineſſe*, and *high eſtimation*

* They differed in the quantitie, not in the qualitie. Zach. 14. 20.

* In reſpect that there is and hath been both by the Lor of the Goſpe, & hearing [of the eare] and in divers other reſpects) more of God, of Chriſt, and of the Holy Spirit, manifeſted in theſe laſt dayes.

eſtimation with *Jeſus Chriſt*. Compare with this the *Hiſtoricall Relations* of *Chriſt*, concerning *infants* in the *Goſpel*; and there the fulling of this *Prophecie* will appeare to be; for there they brought *infants* to him, that he ſhould put his hands on them, and pray; and he approved of their act*, yea, and gave free admittance for the *infants* to come unto him, and charged that none ſhould interrupt the bringers, by forbidding them; becauſe *of ſuch is the kingdome of heaven**; *and he took them up in his armes, and put his hands upon them, and bleſſed them***.

* Mat. 19. 13.

* Mar. 10. 14. Luk. 18. 17.
** Mar. 10. 15.

But to this you anſwer;

A. R. Pag. 14. lin. 3. 4, 5.

Firſt, *That all this is not baptizing them; for Chriſt baptized not*, Joh. 4. 2. *And therefore this place ſeemes not at all to prove the baptizing of Infants*.

Act. 10. 44.

Anſ. The *holy Ghoſt* fell upon *Cornelius*, and his *friends*, at *Peters* preaching, though all this was not *baptizing* them with *water*; yet (they being *baptized* by the *holy Ghoſt*) *who could forbid water that they ſhould not be baptized, which had received the holy Ghoſt as well as* others. So the *infants* which *Chriſt took up in his armes, he layd his hands upon, and bleſſed*, and declared that the *Kingdome* of *God* belonged unto them; *Of ſuch is the Kingdome of heaven* (ſayth he) & *Chriſt* had declared, that without the *Spirit*, perſons could not enter into the *Kingdome* of *God*. But theſe *infants* were *ſubjects* of his *Kingdome*, (according to the doctrine of *Chriſt*) and therefore they had the *Spirit*; and ſeeing the *infants* of *beleevers* are as they were, they have the *Kingdome*, the *Goſpel*, the *Spirit*, and the *graces* of the *Spirit*, and all, and therefore they may lawfully be *baptized*, and therefore theſe places have not onely a *ſemblance* in them, but alſo a *ſubſtantiall ground* for the *baptizing* of the *infants* of the faithfull; It being not *various* in the leaſt, from any of *Gods inſtitutions*, but every manner of way agreeable to the ſame. And though then neither *Chriſt*, nor his *Spirit*, *baptized* with the *Baptiſme* of *water*, but *inſtrumentally*, yet thoſe that have *Chriſt*, and the *Spirit*, have the inward *Baptiſme*, and ſo are to have the *outward Baptiſme*; but the *infants* of *beleevers*, have *Chriſt* and the *Spirit*, (for they have the *Kingdome*, which cannot be without the *Spirit*) therefore the *infants* of *beleevers* are to have the outward *Baptiſme*; As hath been proved before, and even now, and ſhall be further cleared afterwards.

* Ver. 47.

Chriſt did more for *holy Infants*, then *baptize* them with *water*.

Next you ſay;

Secondly, *Let them that pleaſe doe as here Chriſt did, yet much ra-* *A. R.*

A. R.

ther let us all learne the lesson which Christ here taught, without which wee cannot be saved. But wee quite perverting Christs meaning, doe in another sense become little children: for some at first had no sooner hence sounded the shrill time in our eares, that the Kingdome of heaven belongs to little children, and therefore to baptisme: But wee all presently, like little children, dance after this pipe, as though our heads were lighter then our heeles: and in the meane time loose the true sense, the marrow and fatnesse of these Texts which so much doe concerne us.

And thus it is not onely in these Texts, but in many more, as so much that wee through this our childish (if not brutish) following the heard of Interpreters from humane authority, rather take many grosse errours for undeniable principles, then once open our eyes to see and receive the truth upon Gods own bare word, that wee might beleeve and so be saved out of this quick-sand of delusions: And indeed how can wee beleeve, giving and receiving honour one of another, and seek not that honour that commeth of God alone: as Christ tells us, Joh. 12. 44.

To which I answer, That those may rightly doe as Christ here did, who are heires of the Kingdome whereof Christ is King. But before [you] doe as [Christ] here did (take that counsell which you give unto others) learne the lesson which Christ hath here taught, without which, (you say) you cannot be saved. And seeing that the kingdome of heaven consisteth of the infants of beleevers, wee may safely beleeve, and justly challenge, that though they are little in quantitie, yet they are great in qualitie, and most precious in the eyes of the Lord.

Zech. 4. 10.

And surely we have need of humilitie, to teach us, not to be so proud, as to despise the day of [small things.] It is not the way to be happie, to despise those that are happie, though they have not attained to such a measure, as to confesse, or expresse, by verball relations, or visible demonstrations, Gods work upon their soules. And I tell you further, If you hold on in your errours, in withstanding holy informs, and doe not repent of this your evill, you cannot rightly doe as Christ here did, nor learne the lesson wch Christ here taught, (and so upon your own ground cannot be saved) but doe come under the censure (which you have here set downe) of quite perverting Christs meaning, &c. and loosing the true sense, marrow, and fatnesse of these Texts, which so much concerne us: An evident proofe of this appeareth in your interpretation of the Scripture (in the Gospel which speaketh of infants) which you would not have to be meant of those Infants, nor of such as them in age or understanding, but of

Pag. 14. lin. 8, 9.

others, who are *such as these in humiliatie, and such like qualifications*. So that you tying your self unto this restriction*, have indeed lost the *marrow*, and gnawne upon the *bone*, bitten on the *barke*, in stead of the *pith*, the *shell* in stead of the *kernell*.

* In Pag. 13. lin. 26, 27. 38, 39, 40, 41

And thus you have done, *not onely in these Texts, but in many more*, as doth evidently appeare, in these your *Childish Treatises* of *Baptisme*.

And if your *humane Authors* have made you *childish*, and *brutish*, be no more so; If you have followed them in stead of the *Word*, as it so appeareth by your citing them, in your *Childish Treatises*, and *building* upon their *mistakings*, *Repent* then, and *sinne no more*; Open your *eyes*, & see the *truth*; Take hold of the *promises* (if it be possible) that you may be *saved out of the snare, quicke sand of delusions*.

As for the *objections* wch you call *scattering objections*, which (you say) you have met withall; As they are set downe by you, some of them may well be said to be *scattering*. In the first *objection* (in the inference) you speak of *ordinances** in *generall*, wch must be esteemed the *Ordinances of Jesus Christ*, by whomsoever, or on whomsoever they are administred. But here you have not told us, what *Ordinances* are to be esteemed so. But in answering it, you labour to discover the weaknesse of the *Objection*, which is without distinction; and you would inferre, as though the *objectors* meant by *ordinances*, acts meerly so, for so you say, *this objection imports, that had but the Idolatrous Corinthians taken bread and wine, and broken it, and ministred it among their dogs and swine, yea this should have been the ordinance of Christ, if it must remaine so by whomsoever, or on whomsoever it is administred*; And so you demand (upon this) *whether the Apostle received any such ordinance, &c?* And at length you *deny it to be the minde, commandement, or ordinance of Christ at all, and therefore* you conclude, *That for any so call such actions his ordinances, can be no lesse then blasphemie against the Son of God*.

* Pag. 14. lin. 24, 25

* Lin. 29.

* Lin. 33.

* Pag. 15. lin.

* Lin. 15.

To which, I say, that if he who framed this *objection*, meaneth that the *ordinances* of *Christ*, are the *ordinances* of *Christ*, then we are not to understand that he meaneth heer by *ordinances*, meer naturall acts, as giving bread and wine to dogs and swine, he hath not so expressed it; and therefore, though you denied your own inference, or swinish insinuation, yet you could not justly charge him with blasphemie against the Son of God in this particular; But rather those may be charged with blasphemie, who denie the *ordi-*

nances of *Christ*, to be the *ordinances* of *Christ*. And indeed I thinke reason should teach you, that the *ordinances* of *Christ*, are the *ordinances* of *Christ*; for as every thing is the same with it selfe, so every *ordinance* of *Christ* is the same with it selfe.

But (next you say;)

Obj. *They will reply, that bread and wine received by any in such a manner, and water sprinkled in the Name of the Father, &c. are his ordinances, and therefore whosoever hath these, hath his ordinance.*

Ans. I thinke this your accusation, is a meer surmise, or groundlesse supposition. You say, *They will thus reply*; Who are they that will thus reply? I thinke you have no opposite, in withstanding this, except it be such as your selfe. This may well be called *scattering*; for it is the nature of *chaffe*, and *stubble*, to be scattered by the *winde*; and indeed, I thinke that this *objection* (which you make to be a *reply* of others) is your *owne* (if the truth were knowne.) And you might have saved your labour in bringing such frivolous *voyes*. For you know, that our *poynt* is not concerning *eating bread*, or *drinking wine*, or *sprinkling water*, as they are *meerly naturall acts*, but as they are *divine ordinances*. Now to say that the *eating of bread*, and *drinking wine*, and *sprinkling water*, [as they are *meerly naturall acts*] are *divine ordinances*, and that therefore whosoever hath these] *hath his ordinances*, is very absurd. I never did heare it proceed out of any ones mouth, nor read in any *book*, besides your own. I conceive then that you might have saved your labour, and not made answer where there is no opposition, but have kept your *Bartholomew-babies* for *Bartholomew-faire*, unless you could have proved them to be the *Kings Subjects*, as the *children* of *six moneths* old are, whom you have (familiarly by a Supposition *sequalized* with them in your answer. But herein also you are deceived in your *judgement*, it being a very *childish* and *babish* comparison; For you might know (if you have the use of your *senses*) that *Bartholomew-babies* [of the *best sort*] are *unsensible*, but [the meanest *children*] (of six moneths old) are *reasonable creatures*, and therefore it appeareth that your *unsensible comparisons* are *unseasonable* at this time.

Pag. 16. lin. 1. Lin. 2. Lin. 15.

But the next *objection* being sound, you cannot answer, but in labouring to turne it away, discover how deeply you are drenched in deceivable errours, and vaine conceits.

The *objection* of *position* is, that

Ioel said (1 Cor. 10. 1, 2.) *of the children of Israel, that they were*

all

all baptized in the cloud, and in the sea; there being young children, as well as men of yeares.

Your answer unto this is as followeth:

The Text is, that they were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud, and in the sea: But our question is not of baptizing unto Moses, but of baptizing unto Christ, by being dipped or buried in water by the similitude of his death, according to the institution of Christ: Thus were not these Israelites baptized, for they were in the cloud, and in the sea dry, nor was baptisme then instituted; Thus then is the sence of the place; That no enjoying of any outward priviledge, as Baptisme, or the Lords Supper, without true faith, companied with obedience, will now save us any more, then the many outward priviledges, & visible signes of Gods presence, and the great outward deliverances which the Lord by the hand of Moses afforded and wrought for the Israelites, in bringing them through the sea, in defending and guiding them in the Wildernesse; by the cloud did exempt and save them from Gods Judgements; for notwithstanding their enjoying all these outward favours, many of them perished in the Wildernesse for their sinnes and disobedience; which St Paul sets out as examples unto us; and therefore here by way of allusion compareth their outward priviledges, to the outward priviledges and ordinances of the New Testament; Even as St Peter in like manner figuratively speaketh of the Arke, 1 Pet. 3. 20, 21. When once the long suffering of God, waited in the dayes of Noah, while the Arke was preparing, wherein few, that is, eight soules were saved by water; the like figure, whereunto Baptisme doth now also save us, by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.

These then being onely figures and allusions, cannot serve at all to prove the poynt in hand.

The Reply.

That the *Text* doth declare they were all *baptized* unto *Moses* in the *cloud*, and in the *sea*, is cleare, 1 *Cor*. 10. 1, 2. And this place doth make directly against particular parts of your Judgement; as your denying the *Baptisme* of *Infants* to be lawfull, affirming it to be onely *a meer device and tradition of men, brought into the world for politick and by-ends**. Now here you may see who brought it into the *world*; I will not say *God* did it for *politick or by-ends*; for then I should be like the *Serpent*, which would have perswaded *Eve* that *God* [for such by-ends] did forbid them to *eat* of the *tree* of *knowledge* of *Good* and *evill*; thereby to possesse them with this, as though *God envied* their *happie estate*. But wee know that *Gods love* is

A. R. Pag. 16. li. 23.

*See *A. R.* h[illegible] first booke [illegible] in the Epistl[illegible] to the Read[illegible]

is not *self-love*, his *end* was alwayes to doe his *people good* at their *later end*; and by the *baptizing* of them in the *cloud* and the *sea*, he did *prophetically* demonstrate what should be in the dayes of the *Messias*; and herein aymed not onely at his owne *glory*, but at his *peoples comfort*.

See *A. R.* his *Vanitie of Childish Baptisme*, pag. 9.

Secondly, This place maketh against your *Judgement*, in your holding and seeking to maintaine a *necessitie* of plunging the *whole man* in *water* in the *ordinance of Baptisme*; for the *Apostle* sayth, *They were all baptized in the cloud, and in the sea*; But wee will not say, that they were *plunged* in *water* (or *over-whelmed* with the *water* of the *Sea*;) for then they would have been like unto the *Ægyptians*; for the *Ægyptians* were served after this manner *. Neither will wee affirme (as you doe,) that the *Israelites* were in the *cloud* and in the *sea dry*, without declaring what *drines* we meane; for though they went upon *dry ground*, and the *waters were a wall unto them, on the right hand, and on the left* *, yet wee may collect from the Scriptures, that they were *baptized* * with *water* out of the *Cloud* (or *Sea*.)

* Exod. 14. 27, 28.

* Ver. 22; 23.
* 1 Cor. 10. 1, 2. Exod. 14. 19. Psal. 77. 15, 16 17, 18, 19, 20.

But this *Text* you labour to shift off, by telling us, that your *question is not of baptizing unto Moses, but of baptizing unto Christ, by being dipped or buried in water, &c.*

And by this it appeareth that you think this *Baptisme* which the *Children of Israel* received, was not the *Baptisme* of, (or unto) *Christ*, but meerly a *Baptisme* unto *Moses*. But you should know that *Moses* was not such a one as you take him to be; for he was *faithfull* in all his *house*, and brought no *innovations* into *Gods Church*. The *Evangelicall Ordinances* and *Oracles* then, were the things of God; If then they were the things of *God*; *Gods Sonne*, who was alwayes *God* with *God*, was then the *owner* thereof, and he being *the Angel of Gods presence* *, who was with them in the *cloud*, and in the *sea*, when they were *Baptized* *, wee may safely conclude, that the *Baptisme* was his, as well as the rest of the *Oracles* and *Ordinances*. And you should know, that though the *manner* of [*Baptising*] then unto *Moses*, and now unto *Christ*, differeth in *Circumstances*, yet the [*Baptisme*] is one and the same in substance, and therefore the *Apostle Paul* telleth us, they *were all* [*Baptized*] *in the cloud, and in the sea* *; and he putteth no other differences between the two *Baptismes*, but that the one is as the other. And therefore when we speake of that *Baptisme*, wee cannot but speake of the *Baptisme*

Isa. 6[illegible]8, 9.
[illegible]d. 14, 19.

1 Cor. 10. 2.

of

of *Christ* [a]; for as the *Baptisme* of *Christ*, is not the *Baptisme* of *John*, yet the *Baptisme* of *John*, was the *Baptisme* of *Christ*. So though the *Baptisme* of *Christ* is not the *Baptisme* of *Moses*, yet the *Baptisme* of *Moses* was the *Baptisme* of *Christ*; *For Moses was faithfull in all his house as a servant* (for a testimony of those things which were to be spoken afterwards.) *but Christ as a Sonne, who was counted worthy of more glory then Moses*; for he was the *builder of the house*, and therefore is *worthy of more honour then the house*. And seeing they were all *baptized* unto *Moses* (who was commended for his faithfulnesse [c]) there is no just *reason* can be given to debarre the *infants of believers* from *Baptisme* now, or from being *baptized* unto *Christ*, seeing *Christ is worthy of more glory then Moses*; and that the *Sonnes privileges* are no lesse (but more) then the *servants*.

But you bring in exceptions against the *baptisme* then, and so labour to make a *disparitie* between the *baptisme* then in the *cloud* and *sea*, and this *baptisme* now; for you say, *They were not dipt*, and then yeeld this reason; *for they were in the cloud, and in the sea drie*. But I would know of you, how long they were *drie*? Surely they might be *watered*, and yet not be *dipt*! There is a *Medium* between being *dipt*, and being *drie*. Wee reade that the *children* of *Israel* were *baptised* *, but wee doe not reade, that they were *overwhelmed*; (as the *Ægyptians* were *.) But by this it appeareth, that the *Scripture* is of no value unto you, unlesse it will agree with your *fond opinions*; for you would argue, that because they were not *dipped*, therefore they were not *baptised*, at least, not according to *Christs institution*.

And afterwards you say, *Nor was Baptisme then instituted*. So you have answered your selfe, though it be after a writhen manner; If *Baptisme* were not then *instituted*, how could that *Baptisme* be according to the *institution* of *Christ*? though they were *dipt* never so much! I hope you will not say, that *dipping*, or *plunging*, maketh *Baptisme* any more to be of *Christs* institution? For then you will say, that the *Ægyptians* were *baptized* according to *Christs institution*, and not the *Israelites*. But you should know, that the *Israelites* were not baptized contrary to *Christs* institution; The *Angel* of *Gods presence* was with his *people* then, in the *cloud* and in the *sea*, He was the *Instituter*.

Consider then (I pray you) what want was there of any thing needfull unto *Baptisme*?

Did

a Understand heer, that I speake of the *Baptisme* of *water*; for *Christ* is said (by his *authoritie*) to *Baptise* with *water*, as well as with the *holy Ghost & fire*; and so the *baptisme* of *water* is his, whether before or after his *ascension*.

b Heb. 3. 2, 3.

c Ver. 5.

d Ver. 6.

* 1 Cor. 10. 2.

* Exod. 14. 28.

Ob. 1. Did they want an *Institutor*?

Anſ. They had him with them in the *ſea*.

Ob. 2. Did they want an *Adminiſtrator*?

Anſ. The *Inſtitutor* could doe it, or appoint it to be done by ſome other beſides himſelfe; But they were all *baptized* (ſayth *Paul*) therefore I conclude, that ſeeing they had the *Adminiſtration*, it was not without an *Adminiſtrator*.

Ob. 3. Did they want the Element?

Anſ. They had water enough in the *cloud*, and if that had been too little, there was more in the *ſea*; and if the *Angel* of *Gods preſence* (their preſent companion) had ſeen it good, they ſhould have been *dipped*, and ſhould have had as great a quantitie of the *Element* in *Baptiſme*, as the *Ægyptians* had without it.

Ob. 4. Did they want ſubjects?

Anſ. They were the *ſubjects* themſelves, and *right ſubjects* wee may ſay; for they were ſuch who were in *Gods covenant*; of which *Circumciſion* (the *ſeale* of the *righteouſneſſe of faith*) was a *ſigne**.

* Rom. 4. 11. Gen. 17. 11.

This being rightly minded, it may refute your former opinion (to wit) that the *Baptiſme* of *infants* cannot be of *God*, but of *man*, a *vaine*, and *lying tradition**, thruſt upon the *world* under colour; foyſted in like *Antichriſtian devices*.

* Pag. 7. lin. 18. 19. 22.

Now ſure if it were not of *God*, but of *man*, you will tell us what *man* invented it. Seeing you have preſumed ro be ſo bold to goe thus *far*, I pray you (if you can) goe a little *further*, and tell us who *invented* it; you cited *divers humane Authors* *, wch were ſince *Chriſt*, but ſure they were not the *inventers* thereof, for heer you may ſee it was adminiſtred long before they were borne, many *hundreds of yeares*; and ſo your new account commeth too ſhort to prove the *Baptiſme* of *infants* to be *invented* ſince *Chriſt*, for as much as this of *Moſes* undermineth that your ſandie conception. Who invented it then? I pray you tell me, for ſure you can tell! at leaſt you thinke ſo, otherwiſe you would not have termed it as you doe. *Moſes* did not invent it, he was *faithfull* over his *Maſters houſe* as a ſervant, bringing nothing into the *worſhip* and *ſervice* of *God*, but what was *appointed* by *God*; neither would he, or *God ſuffer ſuch* a thing to be acted, and to goe unreproved; except it were according to Gods appointment. Neither would the *Apoſtle* have called it *Baptiſme*, as he doth in 1 *Cor.* 10. 1, 2. had it been an invention of *man*, and not an *inſtitution*, or an action of *Gods*. But you (your ſelfe) have granted it

* Pag. 7. 8, 9.

to

to be a *priviledge* unto them; then ſure you muſt by this confeſſe it was no *invention* of *man*, but the *Lords* doings, though it be marvellous in your *eyes*; and therefore ſeeing that the *children* of *Iſrael* (in the *cloud*, and in the *ſea*) had *baptiſme* conferred upon them by *divine right*; it was not a *humane invention*, nor *diabolicall inſtitution* (according to your former *affirmation*) but an *Evangelicall Adminiſtration*.

Next you take upon you to give the *ſenſe* of the place, but you varie from it; you tell us, that *no enjoyning of any outward priviledge, as Baptiſme, or the Lords Supper, will now ſave us, without true faith, accompanied with obedience*; and I tell you, that I alſo affirme the ſame.

But when you ſhould declare that our *Baptiſme* cannot ſave us without *faith*, no more then their *Baptiſme* could ſave them, you varie from the *poynt* in *particular*, and ſpeake in *generall* of their *many outward priviledges*; and when you come to *particulars*, you mind their bringing through the *ſea* for one, their defence and guidance in the Wilderneſſe by the *cloud* for another; but you omit their *Baptiſme*, the maine thing which you ſhould keepe to at this time, and ſo you run on, and would turne *Pauls* particular teſtimonie, into a generall; whereas *Paul* doth ſpeake in particular, and telleth us, that they were *baptized*.

And at length you come to *Peter*, and take upon you to tell us the *manner* of his ſpeech, how he compareth the *Baptiſme* of the *Arke*, with the *Baptiſme now*, and ſayth, *the like figure Baptiſme doth now alſo ſave us*; and ſo you tell us, that *theſe being onely figures and alluſions, can prove nothing to the poynt in hand*. Thus now you have caſt off both the *Baptiſmes* of the *New* and *Old Teſtament*; for the Apoſtle *Peter* ſpeaketh of the *Baptiſme* of *Noah*, and of the *Baptiſme* now, and ſayth, this is a *like figure* to that, and you tell us, they are *figures*, and *alluſions*; but I thinke you mean *deluſions*; for you ſay, they ſerve not at all to prove the *poynt* in *hand*.

But as for this Anſwer of yours, it is one and the ſame with that in the *Anabaptiſts Dialog*. For there they tell us;

1. That *Moſes did not at all waſh them with water in the cloud and ſea*. 2. *That this of Moſes is called Baptiſme by compariſon, as Noahs Arke is called the figure of the Baptiſme that ſaveth us: for as the Arke ſaved thoſe in it from drowning: ſo the Iſraelites were all under the cloud, and in the ſea, and therein baptized or ſafegarded from deſtruction of their enemies*. 3. *That it pleaſed the Holy Ghoſt to* [*ſay*] *they were baptized*

in the sea and cloud, because the sea and cloud was their safetie, as Noahs Arke was: And as Christ sayth, they are baptized that suffer for his sake: So there is as much warrant to enjoyne Infants to suffer persecution, because it is called Baptisme; as to baptisme them, because the cloud and sea is called Baptisme.

* In his booke called *A censure upon the Anabaptists Dialog pa. 99.*

To this M^r. *Ainsworth* sayth*; *Let them consider* Exod. 14. 24. 25. *compared with* Psal. 77. 16, 17. *&c. And they may see there was* water enough *in the* cloud: *and they will not say (I thinke) that there was no* water *in the* sea. *All outward* baptizing *or* washing, *must be* with water, *or some other* liquor. *If they were not* baptized with water, *what other* liquor *were they* baptized *in? Not* with bloud, *as in the* baptisme *of suffering* death *for* Christs *sake, which they impertinently mention. Not with* wine *or strong* drinke; *for they found none such in the* Wildernesse. *If they can shew nothing but* water *to* baptize *them in, let them deny no more (for shame) that they were* baptized *with* water. God *spake to our* fathers *by the* Prophets *at sundry times (or in 4. sundry parts, as it were by peice-meale) as the* Apostle *teacheth,* Heb. 1. 1. *By* Moses *he shewed how the* cloud *removed from before* Israel, *and stood behinde them, (as they passed through the* Sea) *and gave them* light, *but was* darknesse *to the* Ægyptians: *and from the* fiery cloudy pillar *the Lord looking, troubled the* Ægyptians, *and took off their* Chariot wheeles, *that they drave them heavily,* Exod. 14. 19, 20. 24, 25. *This being briefly and obscurely told by* Moses, God *after by* Asaph *another Prophet, sheweth the manner of it,* how not onely the waters of the Sea saw the Lord, when they fled and parted; but the clouds also from above powred out water when they rained; the skies sent out a sound by thunder, &c. *Thus the ground being softned with the* raine, *occasioned the* Chariot wheeles *of the* Ægyptians (*sticking in the mire*) *to fall off, and hinder their pursuit:* Psal. 77. 16. *&c. After this the* Apostle (*taught by* Gods Spirit) *manifesteth the* mysterie *which before was kept* secret, *namely, how this passage under the* cloud (*which* rained) *and through the* sea, *was a* baptisme *to the* Israelites: *even as* Christian mens washings *in* rivers *or* vessels, *was a* baptisme *to them. And as the* Manna *which* Israel eat, *and* water *from the* rock *which they dranke, was the same* spirituall meat *and* drinke, *which wee have signified by* bread *and* wine *in the* Lords Supper, *so their* washing *in the* cloud *and* sea, *and our* washing *in* vessels *or* rivers, *is* spiritually *the same* baptisme: *from hence we gather the baptizing of our* Infants *by two Arguments:*] 1. All our fathers (*sayth* Paul) were baptized

in

in the cloud and ſea: *therefore* (*ſay wee*) Infants; *for ſeeing there was no other* baptiſme *but that in the* cloud *and* ſea, *ſuch of our* fathers *as then were* Infants, *were at that time* baptized, *or elſe* many *of our* fathers (*even* all *the* infants *of* many thouſand families) *were* never baptized: *which is contrary to the* Apoſtles doctrine. *And if* Infants *had* baptiſme under Moſes, *it cannot be denied them* under Chriſt.

2. *In that the* Apoſtle *teacheth us, that the* extraordinary *and* temporary ſacraments (or ſeales of ſalvation) *which* Iſrael *had, were the* ſubſtance *and* truth *which wee now have, though* Moſes *doth not ſo expreſſe: It followeth upon like ground, that their* ordinary ſeales, *namely,* Circumciſion, *and the* Paſſeover, *were the ſame in truth and ſubſtance with* baptiſme, *and the* Lords Supper, *which wee now have, and being the ſame;* As Infants *had* Circumciſion then, *ſo they are to have* baptiſme now.

Secondly, Whereas they ſay that of Moſes *was called* baptiſme *by compariſon, as if it were not* properly baptiſme: *they ſwarve from the right way: it was as truly and* properly baptiſme *to them, as ours is to us, though the* manner *of adminiſtration differ: even as their* Manna *and* water *were as truly and* properly *the* Sacrament *of* Chriſts body *and* bloud *to them, as* bread *and* wine *in the* Lords Supper *are to us. Otherwiſe the* Apoſtle *ſhould not ſay truly, that they were the ſame.* 1 Cor. 10. 3, 4.

Thirdly, Noahs Arke *is not called the* figure *of* baptiſme, *as theſe corrupters of* Scripture *tell us: but* baptiſme (*ſayth the* Apoſtle) *is a* like figure (*or antitype*) 1 Pet. 3. 21. *So that the ſaving by water of eight* then *in the* Arke, *was a* type *or* figure: *and the ſaving of a* few now *by* water *in* baptiſme, *is an antitype, or* like figure; *both of them* figuring ſalvation *by the* death *of* Chriſt.

Fourthly, Neither doe theſe men *ſet downe the* reaſon *fully and rightly, Why they are ſayd to be* baptized, (*namely,*) *becauſe the* cloud *and* ſea *was their ſafetie, as* Noahs Arke *was,*) *for though it may in ſome ſenſe be granted, that theſe were their ſafetie, as* baptiſme *is our ſafetie,* (*for it is ſaid to ſave us,* 1 Pet. 3. 21.) *yet properly they are ſayd to be* baptized *in the* cloud *and* ſea, *becauſe they were in them* ſacramentally waſhed *from their* ſinnes, *and* planted together in the likeneſſe of his death, buriall, and reſurrection, *as wee are now by* baptiſme, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4, 5.

The cloud *ſerved them for* three uſes:

1. *To protect and keep them ſafe,* Iſa. 4. 5. 6.

2. *To guide them in the way that they should goe*, Numb. 9. 17. &c. Exod. 14. 21. *And these two were* ordinary.

3. *To* baptize *them by powring downe* water, *and this was* extraordinary, *and but* one time *in the* red Sea, *for ought wee finde. And in this respect* Paul *sayth, they were* baptized *in it.*

Fifthly, Their last speech of injoyning infants *to suffer* persecution, *as well as to* baptize *them, is spoken with a wry mouth: for as we injoyne not* Infants *to be* baptized, *though we* baptize *them; so can wee not enjoyne them to* suffer persecution. *But this wee say and know, as* Infants *are* baptized *into* Christ, *so oftentimes they* suffer persecution *for* Christ, *being with their* parents afflicted, imprisoned, banished, &c. *yea, and bereaved of* life *it selfe, so that they have even the* baptisme *of* bloud *or* martyrdome *also.*

Thus you may see, that there hath been (long agoe) a large and sufficient *Answer* made unto this *Answer* of the *Anabaptists* of *old*, which is even one and the same with yours.

Thus much for reply to your *Answer* to the *third objection.*

As touching the *fourth* & *fifth objection* (the charitable construction being set aside) I except against them *both*; but especially the *fourth*;
Pag. 17 lin. 8. that the *outward baptisme* is not needful to him that hath the other.
Lin. 19. And so for the *fifth objection**, which is, that *Baptisme is nothing*, (*though it may beare a charitable construction*) *yet if any conceive* Baptisme *is nothing*; as it is an *ordinance* of *God*, they erre. Neither doe I know any one amongst all the *Seperation*, that holdeth *Baptisme* to
Lin. 26. be *nothing*, but they reverence it as an *ordinance* of *God.*

hristian Reader. See Mr *Henry Barow*, e of the *three Martyrs* (in Q. *Eliza-ths* time,) his discovery of the *false hurch*; for there he treateth on this rticular poynt at large, and reproveth e *scholastical partie*, who did labour perswade the *Queen*, that seeing her *ajestie* had the *inward Baptisme*, and d done many works of *mercy* and *pie-*, that therfore shee might rest her selfe tisfied, whether shee had the outward *ptisme* or no: On the other hand, the *omanists* said, that shee must count the *hurch* of *Rome* a true *Church*, or else nie her *Baptisme*: But these were deived, and did not consider, how that *ods ordinance* is his *ordinance*, though the *depth* of *Apostacie*. See the Ans. your first Treatise. *In Pag. 14, 15, 17.

It is true [as you have granted in answering hereof *] *That in some sence Baptisme is nothing*; even no more was *Circumcision* in former time, yet as it was *Gods holy ordinance*, it was to be regarded as a thing of great concernment, and was not worne out then, though in the middest of *Antichristianisme*, or *Apostasie*; So *Baptisme* now being no *lesse durable*, though more *generall* then *Circumcision* was, not lesse *honourable*, it ought not to be *rejected* but *regarded*, and the *reverent receivers* of it *respected*, and the *contemners* of it *reproved* and *condemned.*

Take notice heer how that in pursuing after these scattering *Objections**, you have strangely *varied* from the *poynt* concerning *Infants*, and

ſo have ſhot at *rovers*. Therefore I would have you (for order ſake) to obſerve what hath been ſet downe by me to prove the *lawfulneſſe* of the *Baptiſme* of *holy Infants*, (againſt all your *objections* which you have ſet downe, unto this period) all which I leave to the conſideration of you, and the obſervation of others, and ſo proceed to anſwer the next which followeth.

BUt (ſay you) * *their fifth and maine* [*Argument*] *is yet behinde: from the Covenant which God made with Abraham and his ſeed*, Gen. 17. *And hence* (you ſay) *thus they reaſon.* * Pag. 18. 2. lin. 2.

As the Covenant *and promiſes were made to* Abraham, (*being a faithfull man*) *and his ſeed, and thereupon all his ſeed were circumciſed in the time of the Law, ſo the ſame* Covenant *and promiſes are made to them, being beleevers and their ſeed: And therefore their ſeed may now upon the ſame ground be baptized.*

Anſ. You have ſet downe an *argument* on your *oppoſites* part, but you have not declared (*in particular*) whoſe it is, whether you mean that the *Seperates*, or thoſe ſome *others*, or other *Churches*, which you ſpecifie (in your firſt part, and the beginning of this your ſecond part) are the *Authors* hereof.

But whoſoever the *Authors* are, you call this *their maine argument*, and it may be you count it ſo, becauſe it is generally layd downe, and undiſtinguiſhed; and I tell you, though the matter may be the *Seperates*, yet the forme is not, but rather your own; for it is *Anabaptiſticall* to infer, that becauſe the *covenant* and *promiſes* were made to *Abrahams ſeed* before the *Law*, that thereupon all his *ſeed* were *circumciſed* in the time of the *Law*; if by [*all*] you mean all his ſeed by *generation* after the *fleſh*; for then it will follow, that all *Iſmaelites*, and *Edomites*, were *circumciſed*, and all other *Apoſtates* of *Abrahams ſeed* by *generation*, beſides the reſt of his *ſeed*: But wee doe affirme, and will prove, that as *Abraham* had no command to *Circumciſe all Nations* (or *ſeeds*, or any *Apoſtate* whatſoever, though the *off-ſpring* of his *body*) but thoſe that were *the ſeed* in *covenant* with *God* *; ſo the *Saints* of *God*, which continued in that eſtate wherein *God* had ſet *Abraham*, were to *circumciſe* none but ſuch as they were; yea, in this reſpect, the *infants* of the *Proſelytes* were preferred before the *infants* of the *Apoſtate* ſeed of *Abraham*; and therefore you may ſee that wee are far from affirming that any *Apoſtate* that ſprung from the loynes of *Abraham*, [(was, much leſſe that all were)] to be *circumciſed*; for * Gen. 17. 1.

Apoſtates whether they were of *Abrahams loynes* or not, they were all viſibly in a bad condition, and not to have the *ſigne* (or *ſeale*) of *Gods covenant* put upon them; And thoſe who were not *Apoſtates*, whether *Jewes* or *Proſelytes*, they were all viſibly in a good *condition*, and were to have the *ſigne* and *ſeale* of *Gods covenant* adminiſtred upon them, and were different, and quite contrary to the *Apoſtates*.

By true *Jewes* and *Proſelytes* and true *Chriſtians*, I mean viſible Saints.

Therefore (to keep to the matter in hand) the Argument for the *Infants* of *beleevers* lieth thus; That as all the *infants* of the true *Jewes* and *Proſelytes* were to have the *ſeale* of *Gods covenant* put upon them then, ſo all the *infants* of thoſe who are true *Chriſtians*, ought to have the *ſeale* of *Gods Covenant* put upon them now.

See *Gal.* 3. 17, 18. and compare herewith the words of Peter, Act. 2. 39. *The promiſe is unto you, & to your children, &c.*

And ſeeing the *Covenant* was (*confirmed of God in Chriſt foure hundred and thirtie yeares before the Law*) and was eſtabliſhed with *Abraham*, and all his *ſeed*, who did not degenerate, and thereupon they were all to be ſealed unto him (as his *peculiar treaſure*) with that ſigne (or token of his *covenant*) which he had appointed then. It followeth that now the ſame *covenant* is *confirmed* of *God* in *Chriſt*, and made ſure unto all *faithfull parents*, and all their *ſeed*, who doe not degenerate, and therefore they may all be *ſealed* unto *God*, (as his *peculiar treaſure*) with the ſigne (or token of his *covenant*) which he hath appointed now.

It followeth alſo that [*Baptiſme* being the *ſeale* of one and the ſame *Covenant*, which *Circumciſion* was a *ſeale* of;] it ought to be adminiſtred upon the *infants* of *beleevers* now, as *circumciſion* was formerly; becauſe that the *infants* of *beleevers* being formerly in the *new Covenant*, of which *Circumciſion* was a ſigne, are not rent out of it by the coming of *Chriſt*, but confirmed in it; for *Chriſt* is no changeling, and therefore *Baptiſme* being now the ſeale of the ſame *Covenant*, it admitteth of the ſame *ſubjects*, and it being not more particular, but more generall then *Circumciſion*, and to be adminiſtred upon *male* and *female*, it appertaineth to the *Infants* of *beleevers*, both *male* and *female*. And this is according to that teaching Oracle, which *God* did in the *cloud*, and in the *ſea*, in which the whole *body* of the *Iſraelites* were *baptized*, both *male* and *female*.

Pag. 18.

But you ſay, *That neither Abraham nor his ſeed were circumciſed, becauſe the Covenant was made with him*: and your reaſon is, *becauſe the Covenant was made with him above twentie yeares before Circumciſion was inſtituted. And yet all this time neither Abraham nor his ſeed were circumciſed; neither had he or any of his ſeed ever been circumciſed, for*

his being in the covenant, had not the Lord afterwards expresly commanded the same.

To which I answer, that though they were not *circumcised* so soone as they were in the *covenant*, neither *commanded* to be *circumcised* then, yet if *Abraham* had not been in the *covenant*, neither he nor his *infants* could have received the ordinance of *Circumcision*, the signe of the *covenant*, according to *Gods* appointment. But *beleevers* and their *seed* that came after, were not to omit *circumcision*; for if they did they brake the *covenant*. Now *Abraham* & his *seed* by vertue of *Gods covenant*, were bound to yeeld obedience to *God*, and to walke in all his *wayes*, as *God* revealed himselfe unto them: So that when once *Circumcision* was *instituted*, it was not to be omitted. See Gen. 17. Exod. 4. 24, 25, 26.

Next * you say;

Nor was that covenant made with Abraham and his seed, meerly for his being a faithfull man (for then should it have been made with Noah being a faithfull man) but for his being such a faithfull man, whom the Lord pleased to choose, and set out as a patterne to all beleevers, Rom. 4. 23, 24. *and to be a father of many Nations*, Rom. 4 17, 18. *And in whose seed all the Nations in the world should be blessed*, Act. 5. 25. & 13. 23. (*to wit*) *in Christ, who was to come of his flesh.* *A. R.* * Pag. 18. at lin. 17.

Ans. The same new *covenant* that was made with *Abraham*, was made also with *Noah*; wherefore as *Abraham* is called *the father of many Nations*, so *Noah* is called *the heire of justice*, which is by *faith*; Such a *faithfull man* as *Abraham* was, such a *faithfull man* was *Noah*; yea, *chosen* of *God*, and a *patterne* to *all beleevers* which should come after him. Heb. 11. 7.

Now whereas you say, that the *Lord was pleased to choose Abraham, and set him out as a patterne to all beleevers*; I suppose you meane all those *beleevers* which came after him, not those that were dead before he was borne; So *Noah* was a *patterne* to *Abraham*, not *Abraham* a *patterne* to *Noah*.

And it is sure that *Abraham* was a *father* of *many Nations*, and so was *Noah*; and that not onely *according to the flesh*, but also *spiritually*; He was a *father* of *many Nations according to the flesh*, because he was the father of *Abraham**, who was the *father* of *many nations according to the flesh*. *Spiritually*, *Noah* was the *heire of Justice*, and *Abrahams father*, as *Abraham* is sayd to be *our father*, and the *father* of all those who walke in his *steps*. And seeing that *Christ* came of *Abraham*, and *Abraham* of *Noah*, therefore *Christ* came of *Noah*, so that * See Luk. 3.

it

it may be sayd (in this respect) of *Noah*, as of *Abraham*, that in his *seed* (which is *Christ*) *all the Nations of the earth* are *blessed*.

Further you say *;

A. R.

* Pag. 18. at lin. 24.

Therefore although the Covenant and promises were made to Abraham and his seed, yet the consequence will not follow, that the covenant is likewise made with all beleevers and their seed; for beleevers onely are the seed, and the seed onely, and none of them a father in the Gospel sence, nor any other save onely Abraham, to whom and his seed the covenant and promises are made.

Ans. That the *covenant* and *promises* were made to *Abraham* and his *seed*, you cannot denie; that the *Proselytes* and their *seed* were *heires* of the same *covenant*, as well as *Abraham* and his *seed*, the *Scriptures* are cleare, *Gen.* 17. 9, 12. *Exod.* 12. 48. *Isa.* 56. So when *Zacheus* beleeved, and so became the sonne of *Abraham*, he had the same *priviledges* which *Abraham* had, namely, that the same time *salvation* was come to his *house* *. Therefore seeing that he was the sonne of *Abraham*, his *infants* were in the *covenant* of *Abraham*. And this is according to what the *Apostle* sayth, *Gal.* 4. 28. *Now wee brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of promise*; if now the *brethren are, as Isaac was*, then their *Infants are as Isaacs infants were*, and are to have the same *priviledges* of the *covenant* as *Isaacs infants* had; But the *former* is true, from the *Apostles Testimony*, and therefore the *latter* is true also. And therefore [*Baptisme* being one of the *priviledges* of the *covenant* of *God* [which they are as capable of as of *circumcision*] they ought to be *baptized*, as *Isaacs infants* were to be *circumcised*.

* Luk. 19 8, 9.

And seeing the same *Covenant* which was made with *Abraham*, was made with *Isaac* and his *seed*, and that *beleevers* are (as *Isaac* was) the *children of promise*. The *consequence* then, that the *covenant* is likewise made unto all *beleeving parents*, and their *holy seed*, is very true.

Whereas you tell us that *Beleevers onely are the seed, and the seed onely, and none of them a father in the Gospel sence, nor any other save onely Abraham.* I tell you, that if *Abraham* had not been a *beleever*, he could not have been the *seed*, much lesse a *father spiritually* unto those who walke in his steps; neither could *Isaac* the *childe of promise* have been as he was.

* Rev. 5. 5.
Rev. 22. 16.

2. Though *Christ* is the *root* of *David* *, yet he is also the *off-spring* of *David* *; so is he the *root*, and the *off-spring*, the *father* * and the *sonne* of *Abraham* *; so that *Abraham* was *Christs seed spiritually*, as all the *Proselytes* were, and in this respect *Abraham* is our *brother*.

Joh. 8. 58.
Mat. 1. 1.

But

But you tell us, *Beleevers onely are the seed, and the seed onely, and none of them a father in the Gospel sence, save onely Abraham*; but you should know, that *Noah* was *Abrahams* father, both spiritually and temporally, and a *beleever*, and so were the holy *Patriarkes* before him, therefore they were the *seed*, and yet wee will not say they were the *onely seed* in the largest extent, for I thinke that all the *Saints* which are, or have been, are not yet the *onely seed*, for there are no doubt many yet to come. Now if by the onely *seed*, and the *seed* onely, you mean that *God* never accepted of any *seed*, but such as they were *spiritually*. I grant the same; that such are the *seed* indeed and in truth; and such a one was *Isaac* in his *infancie*, and such are the *infants* of *beleevers* now, as those *infants* which *Christ* took *up in his armes, and layd his hands upon and blessed*. And though the *infants* are not *fathers*, but faithfull children of the faithfull, yet they have the blessing of *Abraham*, which lighted upon *Isaac* in his *infancie*; and those that are blessed with faithfull *Abraham* are the seed of *Abraham*, and children of the promise; but the *infants* of *beleevers* are blessed with faithfull *Abraham*, therefore they are the children of the promise. Mat. 19. 13.

Moreover, You should not be ignorant, that *Enoch*, *Noah*, *Sem*, *Abraham*, *Isaac*, and divers others, were *fathers spiritually*. But you would have *Abraham* to be the onely *father*; for you say, *None of them is a father in the Gospel sence, save onely Abraham*; so that you exclude all *beleevers* from the *beginning* unto this present, (yea, to the end of the *world*) from being *fathers* any of them in the *Gospel sence*. But you should know, that all beleeving fathers, who have holy children, are fathers in the Gospel sence; and as they are holy, so are their *infants*, who have no more childrē, then *Isaac* had in his *infancie*, yet seeing they are heires of the *Covenant*, wch was made with *Abraham*, they have his blessing. So *Paul* termeth the *children* of *beleevers* *holy* *; and so *Peter* sayth, *The promise is unto you, and to your children*, &c. which implyeth *fathers*; and surely I thinke this is *Gospel* sence, if not *Gospel* it selfe. * 1 Cor. 7. 14. * Act. 2. 39.

Further you say;

Wherefore to affirme that every beleever hath now the same Covenant and promises made to him and his seed, as Abraham had to him and his seed, is very absurd; and is all one as to say, that now every beleever by his beleeving doth immediately become a father of the faithfull as well as Abraham. A. R. Pag. 18. s. lin. 30.

To which I answer as before, that *beleevers* are in the same *Cove-*

nant,

nant, and therefore both they & their *seed*, have the ſame *privilledges* of the *Covenant*, as the *Proſelytes* and their *seed* had in former time. And you ſhould know, that *Abraham* was not the *father* of *Noah*; but *Noah* was the *father* of *Abraham*, and he was before *Abraham*, and therefore was not onely the *father* of *Abraham*, but alſo the *father* of all *beleevers* after him *ſpiritually*. Now though *Abraham* was not the *father* of ſo *many beleevers* as *Noah* was *father* of; yet *Abraham* had the ſame *priviledges* in reſpect of the *new covenant* as *Noah* had: So *Jacob*, though he was not the *father* of ſo many *beleevers* w^ch *Abraham* was *father* of, yet had he the *ſame priviledges*, (in reſpect of the *new covenant*) as *Abraham* had. I will not ſay, that *Abraham* had the *ſame outward temporall priviledges* w^ch *Noah* had; for *Noah* was the *father* of *all Nations* according to the *fleſh*, though not the *father* of *Caine*, or thoſe before him; neither will I ſay, that *Jacob*, or *Iſaac* had the *ſame outward temporall priviledges* in every reſpect as *Abraham* had, for *Abraham* was the *father* of the *Iſmaelites* and *Edomites* after the *fleſh*: And yet this doth not argue, that every *beleever* by his *beleeving*, doth immediately become a *father* of the *faithfull*, as well as *Abraham*.

Abraham ſo-
ourned in the
and of *Canan*
as a *ſtranger*,
but his *ſeed*
did inherite it,
yet the *promiſe*
of *ſalvation*
was equally
made both to
him and his
ſeed, as it is
to us and our
ſeed.

And ſeeing your demand*, *Where any ſeed are, [if] all be fathers*, is grounded upon an [*if*] or *ſuppoſition, that all are fathers*; let it be a *ſuppoſition* ſtill, and ſo (upon this ground) when you bring *ſuppoſitions* (without diſtinctions) builded upon your own imaginations, and proſecuted with ſuch groundleſſe cavillations, you may expect that your building will fall to the ground, as this doth.

* Lia. 35.

To your affirmation, *That their ſeed, and their ſeeds ſeed are all members of the Church, and to be accounted faithfull, and ſo to be all fathers of the faithfull as well as Abraham, from generation to generation to the worlds end.*

in. 36, 37, 38, 39.

I anſwer, That the *infants* of the *faithfull*, are all *members* of the *Church*; and they are not to be accounted *unfaithfull*, though they die in their *infancie*; And ſeeing *Gods kingdome* belongeth unto them, though they have no *children*, nor are *fathers* of the *faithfull* as *Abraham* was, yet they have the ſame *precious priviledges*, as *Abrahams infants* had; So that they are to be eſteemed, now, to be the *ſons of God, and yet it is not manifeſted what they ſhall be*, when their *terreſtriall bodies* (being made like the *glorious body* of their *ſweet Saviour*) ſhall *ſhine celeſtially* in the *kingdome* of *Eternitie*.

Next you would make us beleeve, that you will expreſſe your ſelfe

more

more plainly, (and in the intrim you promiſe this truth) *That there is now no difference between any circumciſion or uncircumciſion, Jew or Gentile, bond or free, male or female, but all are one in Chriſt Jeſus, Gal. 3. 28.* Lin. 40. Pag. 19. lin. 1,2.

And to this I anſwer, that *Gal.* 3. 28. doth not prove, that you have performed what you promiſed, and called a truth; for as you have layd it downe, it is an *untruth*, namely, that there is *no* difference between [*any*] *Circumciſion*, or *uncircumciſion*, *&c.* In this you have done evill, and in *fathering* it upon the Apoſtle *Paul*, you have done *worſe*; for *Paul* is no *patron* of this *opinion*, it was no part of his *doctrine*, that there is no difference between [any] *Circumciſion*, or *uncircumciſion*, *&c.* But he putteth a manifeſt difference between *Circumciſion* of the *heart*, and *Circumciſion* of the *fleſh*; as alſo between *Jew* and *Jew*, namely, he that is a *Jew outwardly onely*, and he that is a *Jew inwardly*; as alſo he putteth a difference between *Gentile* and *Gentile*, namely, an *unbeleeving Gentile*, and a *beleeving Gentile*. So that *Paul* maketh the *beleeving Gentiles*, and the *beleeving Jewes*, all one in *Chriſt*, and not *beleevers* and *unbeleevers* all one in *Chriſt*, for he applieth his ſpeech to the *Saints* onely. So that it appeareth you have quitemiſtaken the *Apoſtle*, yea, there is no *Scripture* which will beare you out in this your abſurd affirmation. Rom. 2. 28, 29.

And now I will come to what you call your plaine expreſſion, which is that;

If every beleever by his beleeving doth become a father of the faithfull as well as Abraham, then it muſt be at the very inſtant of his beleeving that he doth become a father of the faithfull as well as Abraham, and if ſo. Where then will be any children to all theſe fathers; for none can be children before they be faithfull; and alſo at the ſame inſtant ceaſe to be children, and become fathers, which implyes a flat contradiction, and then how can Abraham himſelfe be father of all beleevers, Rom. 4. 11, 12. *A. R.* Pag. 19. at lin. 3.

Anſw. Who doth affirme, that every *beleever* doth *immediately* become a *father*? That which you ſay implyeth a *flat contradiction*, I thinke, is builded but upon a *ſuppoſition* of your owne, as if they ſhould affirme, that *beleevers upon their beleeving, at the ſame inſtant ceaſe to be children, and become fathers*! And then upon this you *aske how Abraham himſelfe can then be father of all beleevers?* Which *interrogation* of yours implyeth rather a *flat contradiction* of the Scriptures of *God*; as if *Abraham* was not both *ſonne* and *father*. Pag. 19. lin. 7

1. A *ſonne* of *Noah* he was, as wee are the *ſonnes* of *Abraham* by *faith* *Iſaacs father-hoodmade him not ceaſe to be Abrahams child*, no more then our *fatherhood* doth make us ceaſe to be his Children.

faith in *Christ*, 2. A *father* of the *faithfull* he was also: So that *Abraham* was both *a sonne* and a *father*.

Lin. 9. You doe not explaine your selfe*, when you *aske how Abraham himselfe then can be father of all beleevers?* for you may know, that *Noah* was *father* of more *beleevers* then *Abraham*, & *Noah* himselfe was a *beleever* before *Abraham*. And if *Abraham* was not his *father*, then he was not a *father* of all *beleevers* who went before him.

But it may be you meane, by *all beleevers*, all that came after *Abraham*, and walked in his steps; for if you mean by *all beleevers*, all that ever *have been*, *are*, or *shall be*, then by your owne ground, there were no *beleevers* before *Abraham* was a *father*, or else you must confesse, that *Abraham* was not a *father* of them. But there were *beleevers* before *Abraham* was *borne*, and *beleevers* there were, and are after him, therefore *Abraham* was, and is, both a *father* of *some beleevers*, and a *childe* of *other beleevers*, as wee are the *children* of him, if wee derogate not from his steps; and are the fathers of our posteritie (after the flesh) who doe not aberate from Gods commandements.

Next you say;

Or how can the promise be sure unto all the seed, if beleevers children be the seed, for they will not affirme that all their children are saved. But this is affirmed of all the seed to whom the promise is made, Rom. 4. 16. Heb. 6. 16, 17.

Ans. You thinke if *beleevers children* be the *seed*, the *promise* cannot be sure to all the *seed*! and why is this? your reason is, *for they will affirme, that all their children are not saved.* But if this be a sufficient reason to prove *infants* not to be in the *promise*, then it will prove that their *parents* are not in the *promise*, nor any other, and so upon this ground you must *baptize* none at all, nor judge any to be in the *promise*, though they professe *faith* never so much, sith that many who are members, and make a verball profession, and ought to be *baptized* by *Christs* rule, fall back, like *Judas Iscariot*, and *Simon Magus*.

But you should rather have questioned thus (according to truth) how can the *promise* be sure to all the *seed*, if *beleevers infants* be not in the *promise*?

And surely, wee are not to argue so perversly, and foolishly, that because [some] *beleevers children* are not saved, (since they rent themselves out of the promise) that therefore [no] *beleevers children*, or that their *infants* are not in the state of *salvation*, and that the *promise*

miſe appertaineth not unto them; for this will not ſtand with true ſenſe or reaſon, nor with the *Apoſtles Teſtimonie*, when he ſayth, Rom. 3. 1, 2, 3. That the *Jewes advantage was much every manner of way*, and that the unbeliefe of *ſome* did not make the *faith of God without effect*. So that the *Apoſtle* himſelfe anſwereth your *objection*; for the *promiſe* is ſtill ſure unto all that abide in *Gods Covenant*.

And ſeeing the *infants* of *beleeving parents* doe abide in *Gods covenant*, they are part of all the *holy ſeed*, and therefore it evidently appeareth, that the *promiſe* appertaineth unto them, as hath been proved before; and this doth as really appertaine unto them, as to thoſe who profeſſe *faith*, and thoſe that deny this, doe in a manner make the *faith* of *God* of none effect, and ſo make the *Author* thereof a *lyar*.

But let ſuch *deſpiſers* of the *children* of *promiſe*, wonder and periſh, without the *promiſe*, rather then that the *Infants* which *God* hath given to *beleeving parents*, ſhould not be counted for the *ſeed*, within the *promiſe*.

But next you ſay;

Now then, if the promiſe be ſure unto all the ſeed unto whom it is made, and all beleevers, and onely all beleevers the promiſe is ſure to: Then all beleevers, and onely all beleevers are the ſeed unto whom the promiſe is made, and then none of Abrahams own naturall ſeed, nor the naturall ſeed of any other in the world, are to be accounted the ſeed, unto whom the promiſe and covenant is made, untill they believe, Rom. 9. 7, 8. Rom 4. 13, 14 Gal. 3 7. 9. *A. R.*

Anſ. It is a ſure *truth*, that the *promiſe* is ſure to all the *ſeed* to whom it is made, and it is made to the *faithfull*, and their *ſeed* that doe not degenerate from their ſteps. But their *Infants* cannot juſtly be ſaid to degenerate from the ſteps of their *holy parents*, who continue in their *righteouſneſſe*; Therefore they are *holy*, and in the *Covenant*, and are the *children* of *Abraham*. And ſeeing you have granted that *all beleevers, and onely all beleevers are the ſeed unto whom the promiſe is made*, then all thoſe to whom the *promiſe* is made, are the *ſeed*, and ſo are *beleevers*; but the *promiſe* was made unto *Abrahams infants*, as well as to others: *God* ſaid unto *Abraham*, that he would be the r *God*; and for confirmation of his *Covenant*, he ordained that the *infants* ſhould have the *ſigne* of his *covenant*, the *ſeale* of the *righteouſneſſe of his faith* in their *infancie*. And the like may be ſayd concerning the *Proſelytes*, and their *infants*, for *God* was a *God* unto them all, Gen. 17.

both *male* and *female*, *bond* and *free*. And the like may be ſayd now concerning *beleevers*, and their *infants*, for *Chriſts love* is not leſſened ſince he manifeſted himſelfe in the *fleſh*; He is the ſame as he *was*, and will be the ſame as he *is*, in this reſpect; and therefore ſeeing wee have not one tittle of *Scripture* for debarring our *infants* of the *priviledges* which formerly appertained to the *infants* of the *faithfull*, wee ought not ſo to ſhut up the *kingdom* of *heaven* againſt them, but ought to beleeve that the *bleſſing* of *Abraham* belongeth to them, as well as to the *infants* of *old*; for it is a ſure truth, that the *promiſe* is *ſure* unto them, and therefore the *ſeale* of the *promiſe* muſt be impoſed upon them.

Now whereas you ſay, that *none are to be accounted the ſeed, till they doe beleeve*; If by beliefe, you mean beliefe by manifeſtation, actually, in their own perſons; What is this but an arguing againſt *Iſaac* in his *infancie*? and a ſhutting him out (in your conceptions) from being then a *childe* of *promiſe*, and a ſhutting out of others alſo, who were as holy as he, & yet could not manifeſt *faith* actually in their own perſons, no more then he could in his *infancie*. And ſo if you mean that none are the *ſeed*, untill they do profeſſe *faith* (as it appeareth you do) is not this to make voyd the *promiſe* of *God*, in ſhutting out all *Abrahams infants*, and the *infants* of all other *beleevers*, and thus (through their ſides) to ſtrike at *Chriſt*, who was once an *infant* like them?

Now the thing which you ſhould mind (but doe not) is that the *Covenant* was *eſtabliſhed* with *Abraham* and his *ſeed everlaſtingly*; with his *infants*, as well as *others*. And as wee may ſay concerning *Abraham*, and his *infants*, ſo wee may ſay concerning the *Proſelytes* and their *infants*; and the like may be ſayd for *beleevers*, and their *infants* now, whom you can never prove to be out of *Covenant*, till they appear to be *ſeeds*; and then do your beſt; but ſo long as they are not *degenerated*, but remaine the *ſeed*, they are to be accounted *holy*, and within the *promiſes*, and *covenant* of the *Goſpel*. And as for the *holy infants*, I know not how they can be charged with *unbeliefe*, or *diſobedience* againſt any of *Gods Commandements*, any more then their *holy parents*, to whom the *Lord* hath teſtified, ſaying, that he ſheweth mercy *to a thouſand generations* * *of thoſe that love him and keepe his Commandements*.

Deut. 7. 9.

Next you ſay;

A. R. pag. 19. lin. 21.

This then *being a moſt evident truth, it may in no wiſe be granted, that the covenant is made with all beleevers, as with Abraham, or that*

the

the promiſe is made unto all theſe, as unto Abraham, or that all theſe are fathers as Abraham, for all theſe are the ſeed, and the only ſeed and children of Abraham: And thoſe to whom the covenant and promiſes doe onely belong under the tearme ſeed.

Anſ. Theſe your words doe imply, that *Abraham* was not any part of the *ſeed*, and that the *covenant* was not made unto him as he was a *beleever*, but meerly as he was a *father*. But when *God* made his *Covenant* with him, He did not ſay, I will be thy *God* meerly as thou art a *father*, and the *God* of thy *ſeed*, meerly as they are thy *ſeed*, and of thy *ſeeds-ſeed*, meerly as they are thy *ſeeds-ſeed*; but he teſtifieth that he will be the *God* of him, and them, though he and they ſhould increaſe to many perſons, yet he would be a *God* unto them all; as he was a *God* unto him; *God* was a *God* unto *Iſaac*, and he was a *God* unto *Abraham*, and he could be no more unto him. What could *Abraham* have more then *God*? a greater reward he could not have, then the reward that exceeded all rewards. Now *God* hath *covenanted* with his *people*, that he will be their *God*, and therefore it appeareth, that the *covenant* is unto them, as it was unto *Abraham*; And ſo it was with the *Proſelytes*, & their *ſeed*, as with the *Jewes*, and their *ſeed*.

And though *this be a moſt evident truth*, yet you ſay, *it may in no wiſe be granted, that the Covenant is made with all beleevers as with Abraham*; yea though they have the *like ſpirituall priviledges*, as *Abraham* had; yet you reſolve, not to grant it, and it is not materiall whether you grant it or no.

Now that they are all *fathers*, as *Abraham* was, I will not take upon mee to prove, but this I know, that they are in the *ſame covenant*, and have the *ſame ſpirituall priviledges*, w^ch^ *Abraham* had. As for your affirmatton, that all theſe are the *ſeed*, and the *onely ſeed*, and *children* of *Abraham*; For explanation, I anſwer as before, that if *Noah* was *Abrahams father*, *Abraham* was not his *father*, and therefore *Abraham* was not the *father* of all thoſe *beleevers* that were before he was borne; for *Noah* (*Abrahams father*) was a *beleever*. And to this agrees your owne words, for you ſay, *beleevers* are the *ſeed*; yea, all *beleevers*, and onely all *beleevers*, are the onely *ſeed*, and the *ſeed* onely, and therefore you may ſee that *Abraham*, though he were a *father*, yet he was part of the *ſeed*; for I thinke you will not deny him to be a *beleever*.

Whereas you ſay, that *if it were otherwiſe, then muſt they be comprehended*,

prehended, (Gen. 17. 7, 8.) *under the termes thou, and then the rest of the phraſe* (*to wit*) and to thy ſeed, *would be in vaine, and ſuperfluous, which to thinke were very irrationall.*

I anſwer, That this which you have ſayd will not ſtand with reaſon; for you ſhould know, that if the *covenant* did appertaine to *Abrahams ſeed,* in no wiſe, as to *Abraham*, then the reſt of the *phraſe,* (to wit) *and to thy ſeed,* would be in *vaine* and *ſuperfluous*, wch to thinke would be very *irrationall* indeed. And the like wee may ſay concerning *Peters* application of the *promiſe* unto *beleevers* and their *children,* that if it is bound up onely in the *parents*, then *Peter* might have reſted at thoſe expreſſions concerning the *parents* particular perſons, and onely have ſayd thus; *the promiſe is unto you,* and not have added theſe words, *and to your children.*

Act. 2: 39.

Abundance of teſtimonies of *ſacred Scripture* might be cited, where the *ſeed* and generation of the faithfull are declared to be in the *promiſe* with their *parents*, but this may ſuffice which hath been ſpoken, that wee may not exclude the *holy off-ſpring*, and bleſſed *iſſue* of the bleſſed; but whenſoever wee happen upon any ſuch place of *Scripture*, where the *ſeed* is ſaid to be in the *bleſſing* with the *parents*, (eſpecially, conſidering that the Scripture affecteth brevitie) wee ought then to mind, that if the *bleſſing* be bound up from the *infants* in the *parents*, then the words are in *vaine* and *ſuperfluous*, where their *children, ſeed, off-ſpring*, and *iſſue*, are mentioned.

But ſeeing that the *promiſe* to the *ſeed*, is not *vaine* nor *ſuperfluous*, nor ever was, it is *irrationall* to thinke, that *God* is not the ſame *God* in extending his *grace* and *mercy* to the *ſeed* of *beleevers*, as to themſelves.

Next you ſay;

Lin. 32.

But the caſe is be granted them to be fathers, as they doe deſire to be like to Abraham, *then muſt they be fathers of onely ſuch as beleeve, and not untill they beleeve, for according to the tenor of the new Covenant, and in the Goſpel ſenſe,* Abraham *himſelfe is father of none other, nor other wiſe.*

Anſ. Though in *ſome* reſpects we deſire to be *fathers*, as *Abraham* was, yet far be it from us, to deſire to be *fathers* as he was in *every* reſpect. You ſhall not *father* ſuch a thing upon us. Wee deſire to be fathers as *Abraham* was (though not in every reſpect) and it is lawfull for us ſo to do, yea our duty, not only to deſire it, but to ſtrive to imitate *Abraham*, in inſtructing our families, and teaching them the way of *life*, according as every one of them is capable to receive inſtructi-

on. But though some of our *children* doe degenerate, as some of *Abrahams children* did, yet it maketh not the *promise* uneffectuall to the rest, no more then it did to the rest of the *children* of *Abraham*, who was a *father* of them in the *Gospel sence*; as wee are *fathers* of these, our *children*, who abide in our *righteous steps*.

And wee are *fathers* of our *own infants*, otherwise then wee are of the unbeleeving *Jewes* and *Turkes*; for ours wee know are in the *covenant*; but the other wee know are not, untill they doe *beleeve*. But when they doe *beleeve*, then have they as great priviledges for their *infants*, as *Isaac* had for his *infants*. And these are, as those were, and therefore as it was warrantable for those to be *sealed then*, so is it warrantable for these to be *sealed now*.

But hence you affirme;

That Publicans and Harlots may be the seed, and have as much right to Baptisme, as any beleevers seed, or as any of Abrahams owne naturall seed; for all and every of these, must first repent, and then be baptized, Act. 2. 38. *A. R.*

Ans. If this be forcible against *beleevers infants*, it is of force against themselves, and if such a reason could have bin strong against *Abrahams infants*, then against *Abraham* himselfe; for the *Heathens* then might become converts as well as now.

Moreover, I tell you, that it is not to the poynt for us to look what persons may be, or may have right unto, but what persons are, or must be judged to be, and what they have right unto; and therefore this position of yours is very impertinently brought against *Infants right* to the *covenant*, or *Baptisme*, especially considering that the *infants* of *beleevers* are neither *publicans* nor *harlots*, nor to be *ranked* with them, or their *infants*, till the *publicans* and *harlots* cease to be so; and *God* create in them a new *spirit*, as he doth in the *infants* of the *faithfull*; and so *circumcise* their hearts, and make them *new creatures*, and give them the same *blessing* which *Christ* gave unto the *Israelites infants*, *whom he took up in his armes, and imposed his hands upon and blessed.*

Whereas you further adde, that

Upon the same tearmes may any, yea, the most wicked in the world, and their seed be baptized.

Ans. It is true, that the *infants* of those who are penitent, and in *Gods covenant*, though they were formerly *wicked*, are to be *baptized* as well as their *parents*. But note this, that *Baptisme* is a *confirmation*

of that being in Covenant, as Circumcision was to *Abraham*, and his *infants*, and to the *Proselytes*, and their *infants*.

Pag. 10. at lin. 4.

Touching your reason for this which you annex (to wit) *that the partition wall is now broken down, and that the Gospel knows no difference between any*; but is to be preached to every creature in the world; and so you cite, *Mar.* 16. 15, 16 *Mat.* 28. 19. *Gal.* 6. 15. & 3. 29.

I answer, That though the former position be true, yet this reason brought to confirme it is impertinent, considering that the *Proselytes*, and their *infants* [in former time] were received into *Gods covenant*, to whom *salvation* was not denied then, though *Christ* were not manifested in the *flesh*, nor the *Gospel published unto all Nations*, as now since, by *Christ* it was commanded to be.

And as for the Scriptures cited by you, they make much for *beleeving parents*, and their *infants*; for as much as the application of the Gospel appertaineth unto them all. In *Mar.* 16. 15, 16. the Gospel is commanded to be *preached* unto [*every*] *creature*; and it is said, that *Whosoever beleeveth and is baptized, shall be saved*; *and whosoever beleeveth not, shall be damned*. And in *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go make all Nations Disciples* (saith *Christ*) *baptizing them*. As if he should say, in former time I bound my selfe *to one Nation*, and published my *name* unto them, but now I stretch forth my hands further, that *all Nations might be made Disciples, and baptized*, as that one nation of the *Jewes* were made *Disciples* and *circumcised*.

When *Christ* saith, *He that beleeveth and is baptized, shall be saved*, he no more extendeth to exclude the *infants* of the *faithfull* from *baptisme*, then from *salvation*: but those that exclude them from the *Covenant*, doe as much as in them lieth, to exclude them from both.

Now sure as we cannot justly deny the *infants* to be *creatures*, to whom salvation or damnation appertaineth, so we cannot deny but that the *Gospel* appertaineth unto the *infants* of *beleevers* (as well as to their *parents*) though they die in their *infancie*, or that the *holy infants* are *Disciples* inclusively with their *parents*, as they have been heretofore.

If then *infants* are *included* in the *generall Commission* (and doubtlesse they are) then they are not to be *excluded*, but the *infants of beleevers* are admitted by *God* to come into the *Church*, with their *parents*, according to the *ancient custome*, which was very profitable and comfortable, and no dishonour to *God*, nor discredit to his cause, nor hinderance to his people, but a *glory* unto his *house*, they being his *pure vessels*, which he *prized* at such a high rate, as to send his *only begotten Sonne* into the world to take upon him the nature of them, and to suffer for them, and to make them *new creatures*, such as are mentioned in *Gal.* 6. 15. which *availeth* with God, when neither

Circum-

Circumcision, nor *uncircumcision* doth; therefore they are not *excluded* from the generall Commission.

Moreover, *Christ* hath declared them to be his, by blessing them, and testifying that they are of his *kingdome*; and seeing then, that *they are Christs, they are Abrahams seed, and heires according to promise*, Gal. 8, 29. and have interest into this *grace* wherein they now are, so that they cannot be deprived of their *inheritance*, no more then those who professe *faith*, and doe act that which these *Infants* have not a naturall capablenesse to doe.

As touching your demand * (which you say is demanded *in coole bloud*) *how* wee *doe become Abrahams seed*; you have testified what wee will say, * (which may be stood to without danger,) namely, that wee become *Abraham seed onely by faith* *. * Lin. 13. * Lin. 14, 15. *Imputatively

As for the inference * (which you bring upon it,) *that so must* our *children by the same way*; wee grant the same, it is one of our *principles*; as also, that there is (as you confesse) *but one seed, and not more in the sence and acceptation of the Gospell*. * Lin. 15, 16.

Next you say *.

They further reason from the equitie of circumcision thus:

As infants then by Gods allowance, received that seale of the covenant, so by proportion why not this now of Baptisme. * Pag. 20. at lin. 18.

And in answer hereunto you rehearse * *Gods commandement to Abraham* cōcerning *circumcision*, and say, *That it was both right & equall that Abraham should doe herein as God had commanded him, and it had been sinfull for him to have done otherwise, more or lesse: And so likewise it is right for us to doe as God hath commanded us to doe, and no otherwise.* * Lin. 21.

To which I answer, that *Gods divine institutions* are full of *equitie*, and there is no iniquitie in them, nor in any thing which he doth, and *God* not only allowed but strictly *commanded Abraham* to *circumcise*, and without the *command* (or *institution*) he was not to put the same in *execution*. But when once *Circumcision*, [*the signe and seale of the righteousnesse of faith*] was instituted, then it was to be administred; and this was right and equall, and allowed of by God.

Now it remaineth for you to prove (if you can) when the *substance* * of this *institution* was taken away.

Peradventure you will say, that *the institution of Baptisme hath put anullitie to the seale*.

I answer, That the inlargement of a thing, or taking away of the *circumstances*, doth not take away the *substance* or *being* of it.

* Mr. *Spilsbery* granteth, that the matter of *Gods* worship is not changed at the cōming of *Christ* in the flesh. See his *Treat. Bap.* pag. 19 lin. 1

 Where-

Wherefore it appeareth, that the command for *sealing* of *Infants*, is not yet *abrogated*, but remaineth still; and seeing *Baptisme* was *instituted* by *Christ*, in stead of *circumcision*, the *infants* are to be *baptized*.

Lin. 28. But yet you question *, *Where the institution for baptizing of infants is?* And my answer is, That the *Institution* for *sealing* of the *infants* of the *faithfull*, was given to *Abraham*, and *Baptisme* being in stead of *Circumcision*, and more *generall*, and it being now the *seale*, they are to be *baptized*, as formerly they were to be *circumcised*.

Lin. 30. But you say *, *That was to circumcise, not to baptize, that all his males, not his females, that all borne in his house, or bought with money, at eight dayes old.*

Ans. All this maketh nothing against the *baptizing* of *Infants*; for the *signe* and *seale* of the *righteousnesse* of *faith*, is not *ceased*, but the substance thereof continueth, though the outward *shadow* or *element* is departed, and delivered unto us (as it were) in another *garb*. And you granted before, that the *females* were implyed in the *males*.

And you ought to know, that the generalitie of the latter Commission above the former, doth plead a specialitie which the *Infants* have in the latter, as well as in the former.

Lin. 32. But you say *, *If they ground it from this institution, then must they observe it in every thing, for so did Abraham, who had sinned in doing otherwise in any thing.*

To this I answer, That we may well ground this, from the institution of that, though we are not tyed to observe that in every thing. The *institution* for *sealing* the *infants* of the *faithfull*, ought to be observed by us, in every thing, and though *God* have altered the *circumstances*, as he hath done in divers other *ordinances*, (the *substance* of which wee have now in the *ordinances* of the *Gospel*) yet wee must not therefore *neglect* the *substances* of them, considering that they are not taken away by the alterations, changing, or taking away of the *circumstances*.

The *Passeover*, & the *Lords Supper*, were all one in *substance*, though they differed in *circumstances*; the *Baptisme* of *John*, and the *Baptisme* of *Christ*, were one, though they differed in some *circumstances*. And the like may be instanced in divers other *ordinances*, wch are equivolent and sutable each to other; And therefore it will hold in *Circumcision* and *Baptisme*. And so this still pleadeth the *divine right* which *Infants* have to the *seale* now, as they had to the *seale* then*.

See this treatise, pag. 121. Lin. 7.

Now, that which is not onely *permitted* (or *allowed*) but *commanded*, it is both *right* and *equall* it should be observed, *Deut.* 12. 22.

But *God commanded* the *outward ſeale* of his *Covenant* of *grace* to be impoſed upon the *infants* of his people, *Gen* 17. 11, 12, 13. *Rom.* 4. 11. This *commandement* in reſpect of the ſubſtance of it, was never yet abrogated or diſanulled.

Therefore it is in the ſubſtance of it, ſtill to be continued, and it is both *right* and *equall* it ſhould be obſerved.

Next you ſay?

*Here they ſay *, Wee have another inſtitution to baptize all Nations, Mat. 28. 19.* A. R. *Lin. 35.

But heer you ſhould obſerve, that wee ſtand not for the *baptizing of all Nations*, but as they appeare unto us by the *rule* of the *Word* to be *Diſciples*. Secondly, Though this be *generall*, in reſpect of the *ſubjects*, yet it is a *particular inſtitution* to *baptize*, as *Abrahams* was to *circumciſe*.

And now let us heare your anſwer.

*Then they ought to obſerve that inſtitution, which is firſt to make Diſciples, and then to baptize them ſo made: for ſo is the inſtitution, and no otherwiſe *.* A. R. *Lin. 37.

To which I reply, That wee do obſerve that *inſtitution*, We plead not for the *Baptizing* of thoſe who are not *Diſciples*, no more then that any were formerly to be *circumciſed*, who were not *Diſciples*; for the *inſtitution* of *circumciſion*, and of *Baptiſme*, is one and the ſame, though the *circumſtances* in the *ſeverall acts* are different, as I ſhewed before; and *infants* are as capable to be *Diſciples* now, as they were formerly, and you cannot juſtly deny, that the *infants* of *beleevers* are *Diſciples*.

Now though none were to take a ground for *Circumciſion* from the *inſtitution* of *Baptiſme*, yet from *Circumciſion* they might take a *ground* for *Baptiſme*; not to enlarge the *inſtitution* of *Chriſt* for *Baptiſme*, as if it were *leſſe generall* then the *inſtitution* of *Circumciſion*, but to *ſhew* the *largeneſſe* of *Circumciſion*, that thereby wee may confute thoſe that doe ſeeke to make *Baptiſme* (in reference to the ſubjects) more *ſtraiter* (or *leſſe generall*) then *circumciſion*; for *circumciſion* was acted upon the *male infants*, *in which* (you confeſſed) *the female infants were included*. And I know not how any can without *ſacriledge*, *rob* (or *deprive*) both the *infants* of the *male*, & *female kinde*, of theſe holy things, which

If *Chriſts Commiſſion* for *Baptiſme*, do not concerne *infants* at all, but aged perſons, as *ſome men* dreame, then his dayes are dayes of *famine*, & not of *foode*, time of *poverty*, not of *plenty*, of *leannes*, not of *fatnes*. Now wee ought to note, that the *glory* of the *firſt Commiſſion* is included in the *ſecond*; if then the ſecond be leſſe *generall* then the firſt, & have ſwallowed up the former, and yet not increaſed, but diminiſhed, then it is like *Pharoahs* 7 leane eares of corne, and 7 leane kine, which ſwallowed up the fat ones. But *Chriſts Commiſſion* is much larger then that given to *Abraham*, and therefore they dreame, that *infants* are not in the latter as well as in the former, is falſe.

are ſo largely diſtributed ſince *Chriſts* manifeſtation in the *fleſh*; for conſidering that *infants* were once to be commanded to be *ſealed* in their *infancie*, and are not forbidden in the Scripture, they ought to be *ſealed*: But it was once *commanded*, that the *infants* of *beleevers* ſhould be *ſealed* in their *infancie*, and is no where *forbidden* in the Scripture; therefore the *ſeale* of the *Covenant* ought to be impoſed upon them in their *infancie*.

* See *A. R.* pag. 5. lin. 24.

And ſeeing you have acknowledged, that the *females* were *included* in *Circumciſion*, or in the *circumciſed males*; therefore your *objection* against the *poſition* *, (by way of anſwer) that *Abraham was not forbidden to circumciſe his females*, is to no purpoſe, unleſſe it be to contradict your ſelfe; for ſeeing you have granted the *females* to be included, they were not excluded; therefore your compariſon heer of the *males* of *Abrahams beaſts*, as his *camels* and *aſſes* with *Abrahams infants*, either *male*, or *female*, is not equall; no more then that of the *Bartholomew-babies*, which you formerly ſhewed (in *pag.* 16.) But ſtill it appeareth, that our *poſition**, being builded upon a right foundation, remaineth permanent, for it cannot be ſhewed, either by expreſſe command, or neceſſary conſequence, that *God* hath forbidden the *baptizing* of *holy Infants*.

* Pag. 21.

* Lin. 7.

* Pag. 20 l. 40.

Moreover, Whereas you labour to ſeeke out what they mean, that affirme, *Infants now are as capable of Baptiſme, with all its ſignifications, as infants then were of circumciſion.*

in. 13.

Anſ. I thinke they intend that the *infants* have not onely a *capableneſſe*, but alſo a *right* to receive the *ordinance* of *Baptiſme*, as the *infants* of *beleevers* had not onely a *capableneſſe*, but alſo a *right* to the *ordinance* of *Circumciſion*. And I ſuppoſe, if you ſeek to prove that the *infants* of *beleevers* were more *capable* of *Circumciſion*, and had more *right* unto it, then the *infants* of *beleevers* are now *capable* of *Baptiſme*, or have *right* unto it now, you will looſe all your labour.

Pag. 21. lin. 19.

But you (in your anſwer *) doe affirme, that ſo all *infants* in the world are capable of *Baptiſme*, and ſo all *infants* from *Adam* to *Abraham* were *capable* of *Circumciſion*. And next, your demand of them why theſe were not *circumciſed*? You ſay, *They will ſay, becauſe Circumciſion was not then commanded; but as ſoone as it was commanded, it was done.*

But I tell you for anſwer, That to affirme, that as ſoone as *Circumciſion* was *commanded* to be done upon ſome *infants*, it was done (or to be done) upon *all infants*. It is an untruth, as this demand * is

Lin. 20.

your

your owne, so I doubt not but the *answer* * thereunto is yours also; for your tenets leadeth you to this, that *Abraham* might *circumcise* any *Apostate* he would, so that he brought them in his *house*, though they neither *feared God*, nor reverenced *man*. I will not say, this is *childish*, but I am sure it is *foolish*, and *brutish*, to have such unreverend thoughts, of the *ordinance* of *Circumcision*. But I suppose, that *Abraham* could better understand the minde of *God*, then those who labour so to debase the *ordinance* of *Circumcision*, and the *right subjects* thereof. As all those doe who affirme, that *all the infants in the world, from Adam to Abraham, might have been circumcised, if God had instituted Circumcision then*. But this is to bring in the *seed* of *Caine* with the *seed* of *Seth*, the *infants* of the *idolatrous Heathens*, with the *infants* of *Abraham*; and so to make a compounded mixture in the *Lords Church*, which he alwayes *laboured* to *keep* from *pollution*, by sequesterating them from the *vile*.

* Lin. 31. compared with lin. 19, 20.

Furthermore, You make answer to a *position**, which is, that *God gave to* infants Circumcision, *which was a* signe *and* seale *of the* righteousnesse *of* faith *and* regeneration, Gen 17. 11. Rom. 4. 11. *and we know* God giveth no lying signe, *nor* sealeth *a* Covenant *to any* persons *that are not* therein: *Therefore* infants *are in the* Covenant, *have* faith *and* regeneration, *and so ought to be* baptized *now, as well as* circumcised *then*.

* Lin. 26.

To this your answer is *, That *it is true, that God giveth no lying signe, nor sealeth to any persons that they are in the Covenant, when they are not therein*.

* Lin. 30.

To which I reply, That I like it well, that you will now confesse this *truth*.

But it appeareth by your following words*, that you take for granted, a thing which you have not proved, as if *God* declared and made knowne unto *Abraham*, that *Ishmael* was not in the *Covenant* before he was *circumcised*. And you cite *Gen.* 17. 18, 19, 20, 21. Which Scripture maketh nothing for your purpose; for if you will say, *God* established his *Covenant* onely with *Isaac*, and none other, and all the rest were out of the *Covenant*, then it will follow, that the *rest* of *Abrahams children*, which *Abraham* had by *Keturah*, yea, and the *Proselytes*, and their *children*, were out of the *Covenant*, by your ground. But you should consider, that *God* in establishing his *Covenant* with *Isaac*, and setting him out for a *singular person*, did give *Isaac* the *preheminence*; as *Sem* had above *Japhet**, and *Judah* (*Jacobs* fourth

* Lin. 11, 13, 14.

* Gen. 9. 27.

Gen. 49. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12.

fourth (sonne) over his *eleven brethren* *; And *God establishing* the *Covenant* with *Isaac* as the root, did establish it unto all those who were of the true *Religion*, as the *branches*; but if any *departed* from *Isaacs* *manner*, they *deprived* themselves of *Isaacs blessing*.

Now for as much as it was the minde of *God*, that *Ishmael* should be *circumcised* *, and that *circumcision* was the *signe*, and *seale* of the *righteousnesse* of *faith*; It confirmeth it, that in the account of man, he was then to be *judged* worthy of it, even *righteous*, and in *Gods covenant*; for *God* is not (by your owne *confession*) the *author* of a *lying signe*, nor *sealeth* to any persons, that they are not in the *Covenant*, when they are not therein. Now this is in respect of *visibilitie* *; for *Simon Magus* had *Baptisme* (the *outward visible seale* of the *Covenant*) and yet we cannot say, that he was ever in *Gods secret account* in the *Covenant*: *But secret things belong to God*.

* master *Spilsbery* granteth, that *Ishmael* and *Esau* were by *God* commanded to bee circumcised as well as any of the rest of *Abrahams seed*, *Gen.* 17. 10. 13. See his *Treat. of Bap. pag.* 7. *lin.* 3, 15.

* So *Iscariot* and *Magus* were commanded to be baptized as well as *Peter* and *Paul*.

* And so Mr. *Spilsbery* further granteth, That *though such were rejected as were not elected, this made not the promise of God of none effect to those who stood firme in the Covenant by grace in Christ Jesus, as branches in their root*, pag. 17. lin. 21, 22.

And till *God* declared unto *Abraham*, that *Ishmael* was not in the *Covenant*, though he promised to give *Isaac* never so many *priviledges*, yet *Abraham* was not to *judge* *Ishmael* to be out of the *Covenant*, (any more then others of his household) till *God* had directed him so to *judge*.

Againe, I suppose that *Ishmael* [being come to *yeares* of discretion] it was *sacriledge* in him to usurp the *ordinance*, and a sinne in *Abraham* to *impose* the same upon him, except he were in the *Covenant* (so farre as men were to judge) of which *Covenant*, this (by your own confession) was no *lying signe*.

Now though *Infants* were not capable to *resist*, or *refuse* to be *circumcised*, yet those of elder *yeares* could, and *Ishmael* was *thirteen yeares of age when he was circumcised*. Therefore *Ishmael* submitting according as he and the rest of *Abrahams familie* were taught, (who were at yeares of discretion) was to be esteemed to be in the *Covenant*.

Moreover, That the children who were *circumcised* (according to *Gods* appointment) were visibly in the *Covenant* before they were *circumcised*, is apparent by *Gen.* 17. *ver.* 14. *God* sayth, *The uncircumcised man childe, whose flesh of his fore-skin is not circumcised, that soule shall be cut off from his people, he hath broken my Covenant*. Which doth plainly argue that he was in the *Covenant* before, else how could he breake that which he never had? And *Abrahams children*

then

then could not be sayd to be rent out of the *Covenant*, wherin they were never in, or rent from a *people*, who were none their's; but we may rather conclude, that as *Gods covenant* was their *covenant*, & *Gods people* their *people*, so *God* was their *God*, as he had testified himselfe to be*, before they were *circumcised*, & *circumcision* was added as a *signe*, for *sealing* or *confirming* of the same thing *signified* thereby. But whereas *God* himself calleth *circumcision* his *Covenant*, meaning expressly a *signe* of it; and *Paul* calleth it a *seale of the righteousnes of faith*; you say, *It was not by God ordained, nor by Abraham understood to be to the persons circumcised, a seale of their being in Covenant, and much lesse of their being in the faith, or regenerated.* †

& so by this it seemeth, that you would make the words of *Paul*, and of *God* himselfe to be false; for you openly contradict them both; as also that which you granted before, (namely,) that *God giveth no lying signe, nor sealeth to any persons, that they are in the Covenant, when they are not therein.*

Next you say, that *Gen.* 17. 11. and *Rom.* 4. 11. must be understood ‡, *that the circumcision which Abraham received, both upon himselfe and seed, was to him and them a signe, and seale, that righteousnesse should be, (not by the law or circumcision in the flesh) but by the faith which Abraham had when he was yet uncircumcised. That he should be the father of all those of many Nations, which should afterwards believe: and that as faith was imputed unto him for righteousnesse, even so likewise it should be imputed to all beleevers whatsoever, whether they were circumcised or not. And that all those are, and were to be the onely lawful and true seed, to whom the everlasting covenant and promises of life are assuredly made, and doe properly and undoubtedly appertaine, ver. 9. 11. 12. 13. 14. 16. 17. 18. 22. 23. 24. And therefore (you say) Circumcision never was, nor is any rule for baptizing.*

Ans. That the *circumcision* which *Abraham* received, was received by him, is true, but that the *circumcision* of his *seed*, was received by him, wanteth explanation; it would stand more with *reason* to say, that *Abraham* administred it upon his *seed*, and that his *seed* received it; then to say, that *Abraham* received the *circumcision* of his *seed*, [upon *himselfe*.] *Abraham* received his owne *circumcision* upon *himselfe*, and his *seed* received their *circumcision* upon *themselves*, and so it was to each of them a *signe*, and *seale*, not that it was divers sorts of *circumcisions*, (because it was administred upon divers parties,) but the

* and also I will be their God.] That is (sayth Mr. Spilsbery) their God, whom they shall believe and obey, upon whom they shall depend for performance of all that I have promised unto them, by which faith and obedience they shall acknowledge me to be their God. See Spil. Treat. Bap. pag. 12.

† Gen. 17. 10. b Ver. 11. c Rom. 4. 11.

‡ See A. R. Pag. 21. l. 37, 38, 39.

See A. R. * Pag. 22.

the same ordinance of *circumcision* which *Abraham* received upon himself, in particular, the same ordinance of *circumcision* his *infants* received upon their selves in particular also.

And if you did but well consider the *Text*, *Gen.* 17. 11. & *Rom.* 4. 11. you might see, that it was a *sign and seale of the righteousnesse of faith*, which went before *circumcision*.

Consider moreover, what benefit the *infants of believers* [which died in their *infancie*] had by it; for if you will say, that it was a *sign and seale of that righteousnesse* which they never were partakers of, [or for ought we know shall never be,] then your owne confession will come against you, where you grant, that *God* giveth *no lying signe*, &c. Now *circumcision* was a true signe of that *righteousnesse* which they had received formerly, and for confirmation of the *covenant* [which had been] made to them before, and to be further and further manifested, and continued to them. This is cleare from *Gen.* 17. 11. 14. & *Rom.* 4. 11. as hath been shewed before.

And therefore you may see, that I plead not that that *righteousnesse* came by the *Law* or *Circumcision*; for they were *righteous* before, otherwise they could not have been capable of the *seale* of *righteousnesse*.

The *righteousnesse sealed*, was a *righteousnesse* before the *seale* was *sealed*, and the *righteousnesse* was *imputed* unto them all, both *young* and *old*, *great* and *small*, *infants* and *aged persons*; It was unto them a *signe and seale of righteousnesse*, yea, unto the *Infants* as well as others.

And this *righteousnesse* which it *sealed*, was not the *righteousnesse* of the *Law*, but *the righteousnesse of faith*, and the *righteousnesse of faith* speaketh on this wise, *Say not in thine heart, Who shall ascend up into heaven, that is, to bring* [Christ] *downe from above? or who shall descend into the deep, that is, to bring up* [Christ] *againe from the dead? But what sayth it, the Word is nigh thee, &c.*

Wherefore it appeareth, that you have not done well, in inferring from the *premisses*, that *circumcision* is no rule for *baptizing*, you ought rather to have concluded, that it is a rule for *baptizing*, seeing that *circumcision* was a *Gospel seale*, & that the *Baptisme* which *Christ* hath instituted, is one and the same with it, a *signe* of the same thing, a *seale* of the same *Covenant*. And therefore though *circumcision* is not the [onely] rule for *baptizing*, yet it is a *rule*, which the *Saints* of God may strengthen themselves withall, in the *administration* of *Baptisme* upon their *infants*.

Consider

Consider further; What *circumcision* profited to the *infants* of *believers*, (that *died* in their *infancie*,) what good it did doe them; either it did them *good*, or *hurt*. It was a *wound*, or *hurt* (in respect of their *bodies*) but it did not *hurt* their *soules*, therefore it was a benefit to them; for if it should not, then *God* gave a thing to *hurt* their *bodies*, and to doe no *good* to their *soules*. The land of *Canaan* it *profited* not unto them; for they never lived to enjoy it; *A fleshly further good*, it *sealed* not unto them; for they *died* in *infancie*. What did it *seale* then? Did it *seale* nothing? We will not say so; they being the *infants* of those whose *sinnes* were *forgiven*; and they being such which could not act, and therefore not commit *actuall sinne*. Surely (when all commeth to all) wee must *confesse*, that this *sealed* unto them some *spirituall* thing; for (they having received the *wound*, and *bloud-shed*, and *dying* in their *infancie*) it appeareth, that it *sealed* not unto them a *naturall life*, therefore it *sealed* unto them a *spirituall life*, and a *spirituall place*, wherein they shall enjoy that *spirituall life*; which place, is the *heavenly land* of *Canaan*. *God* did not aime at the *hurt* of the *infants* when he commanded them to be *circumcised*, but at their *good*. Wherefore this very *hurt* of their *bodies*, did demonstrate some *good* thing, which weighed downe all their former *hurt*; and therefore seeing that *infants* received benefit (spiritually by *circumcision*, that *benefit* came from *God*; *God* gave it to the *fathers* before *Moses* was borne, almost *fowre hundred yeares*. And he never intended to take away this *beneficiall ordinance* from the *infants*, but to plant as great a one in stead thereof, and make it sure to them, yea, as sure as the *promise*. Otherwise *Christ* should be lesse *faithfull* in his *house*, then *Moses*; for *Moses* was so *faithfull*, that he durst not (nay, would not) presume to lay such *sacrilegious hands* upon *Circumcision* (*Gods holy institution*) as to bereave *infants* of the *ordinance*, and disanull it by his *old law*, which came long after it; yea, the *Apostle* expressely declareth, that the *Law could* not disanull the *covenant*, and wee know it did not disanull the *signe* and *seale* of that *covenant*; neither did *Christ* ever disanull it, or bereave holy *infants* of the benefit of it; but did take off the *old garments*, and put on a *new*. I mean, changed onely the *circumstantiall* part of the *signe* of his *covenant*, but the *substance* remained still, though under another element.

And as a *man* which hath *one day*, one *manner* of *apparrell*, *another time*, another *sort* of *apparrell*, of *another colour*, and more *excellent* then the former, is still the same *man*, though in another habite; so

the *ordinances* of *Christ*, which are *equivalent* one with the other, are the same, though the latter excell the former. So the *seventh day* was the *same* with the *first day* of the *weeke*, as it was a *Sabbath*, though not as it was [the] *seventh day*. Yet as wee may take a *ground* for the keeping of [a] *Sabbath*, from the *old Testament*, leaving out the *circumstance*, not tying our selves to [the] *seventh day*; so wee may take a *ground* from *circumcision*, as it was [a] *signe* and *seale* of the *righteousnesse of faith*, whereby wee may be grounded in the administration of *Baptisme*. And it is strictly to be minded, that *Baptisme* is not *larger* than *circumcision* one way, and *lesser* and *straiter* (I mean lesse *generall*) but (in every respect) it is *as generall*, yea, and (in some respects) *more generall*: *As generall*, because such *males* who had *right* to *circumcision*, have *right* to *Baptisme*: *More generall*, because *circumcision* was to be *administred* only upon the *males*; but *Baptisme* upon *males* and *females*. Now to make it *more generall*, and *lesse generall*, then *circumcision*, is a *contradiction*, and you by no meanes will allow of *contradictions*, at least you pretend it.

Now though *Baptisme* be *greater*, and *more generall* then *circumcision*, in respect of the *subjects*, upon whom the same is administred, yet it doth not therefore argue, that *Baptisme* is the *seale* of *one covenant*, and *circumcision* the *seale* of *another covenant*: The *River* of the *Sanctuarie*, mentioned in *Ezechiel*, though it was not so deep in one *place*, yet it was the same *River*; And a *small light* and a *greater light*, is all one and the *same light*, though the *greater* seem (in a manner) to swallow up the *lesser*: So a *fire*, is still the *same fire*, though it be *increased* as much again as it was, fastening upon more *fuell*, yet it is still one and the same, though much greater then before. So *Baptisme*, although it be *supposed* upon the *females*, and differeth in respect of the *subjects* from *circumcision*, yet it is one and the same in effect, a *seale* of one and the *same covenant*; for the enlargement of a thing (as I said before) changeth not the *nature* of the thing enlarged, but maketh it to include more then it did before.

Where as it is said, that *Infants were then members of the Church*, and whereas it is demanded, *When they were cast out?* To this you answer;

That

a *Master* promise to give his *servants* such or such a portion in *hand* or *security*, and above his usuall (or ordinary) custome, give it them *silver*, weight for weight, is all one. He hath fulfilled his *promise*, seeing he lessen not the *summe*, and his *servants* (if they are wise, & know what is good for them will not take exceptions thereon, retule the same, so is it with *God* and his *people*. The things which giveth unto them, are *better*, not *worse* and *greater* and *larger*, not *lesser* and therefore may apply this to this particular case in hand, and so we with *David*, that *God* hath magnified his *Word* above all his *Name*.

a Pag. 32. l. 11.
b Lin. 12.
c Lin. 13.

That they were cast out when the Jewes Church-state, and old covenant was abrogated by the comming of Christ, and preaching of the Gospel, and planting other Churches, farre different from that of the Jewes in many respects. Line 16.

To this I reply; That this which you have said, proveth not at all, that *infants* were cast out; There is not one tittle of *Scripture* in all the *New* or *Old Testament* to this purpose, that the *infants* of *believers* are (or shall be) cast out; Bring me one Instance, if you can, of any one *infant* of a *beleever*, that at *Christs* coming was to be cast out, & then you will say something for their exempting out of the *covenant*, but as yet you have brought none, neither can you finde any, but many, yea, multitudes of Scripture there are to the contrary, both in the *new* and *old Testament*.

But you seem to poynt out the time when the holy *infants* were cast out of the *Church*; You tell us, they *were cast out when the Jewes Church-state, and old covenant was abrogated by the coming of Christ, and preaching of the Gospel, and planting other Churches, farre different from that of the Jewes in many respects.* But alas, you take for granted, a thing which you have not proved, and it is no marvaile indeed, to see the thing that is not probable, to be without proofe. That the *Jewes Church-state* was *abrogated* with the *old covenant*, I am not bound to *beleeve*, except I see it in *Gods Word*, much lesse will I grant, that the *preaching* of the *Gospel* overthrew the *Church-state*. But seeing the *new Jerusalem hath gates and foundations, according to the number of the twelve Tribes, and twelve Apostles of the Lambe, and that the Jewes and Gentiles being grafted into one Olive tree*, make up but one *Church*. I must conclude, that the *Church* of the *Jewes* is the *Church* of the *Gentiles*; for *Christ* is not properly the *head* of *two bodies*; neither did he come to *abrogate* the *old Church*, though he *abrogated* the *old covenant*. Rev. 21. Rom. 11.

But now let us see how farre you would make this *Church* different, from the *Church* of *Israel*; you know, it must be either in *matter*, or in *forme*, or in *both*, otherwise, (I suppose) (you will strive without an opposite,) for all *Christians* generally doe *confesse*, that they were bound to observe such *circumstances*, which wee are not bound to observe; but all this did not argue, but that their *Church* was fit matter, and a *right* forme, and the same with the *Church* of the *Gentiles*.

[a] So Mr. *Spilsbery* sayth, The *Church of God under the old Testament, and that now under the new, for nature are one, in reference to the elect of God, called to the faith and by the spirit of grace united to Christ, as branches to the vine, and so are the plant of Gods planting, which indeed the true Church of God consists.* See his *Treatise of Baptisme pag.* 112. *at lin.* 34.

* At lin. 20.

But you say*, *That was constituted upon nature, and the naturall seed of Abraham; this upon grace, and the spirituall seed of Abraham.*

To wch I answer, That if by *nature*, you mean *corruption*, as it appeareth you do, then (by your ground) the *Church* of the *Jewes* was *constituted* upon *corruption*, & was a *corrupt Church*, a *leperous Church*, in the very *constitution*. You think, that the *Church* of the *Jewes* in her *constitution*, (wch was of *Gods building*, *Isa.* 5. 1, 2, 3. * & consisted all of *visible Saints*, *Deut.* 29. 18.) to be *corrupt*. For the like you said before in your book, *pa.* 4. That they stood meerly upon *nature* and *circumcision* of the *flesh*, & not by *faith*, and *circumcision* of the *heart*. And here you oppose this *nature* unto *grace*, & the *naturall seed* unto the *spirituall seed*. And thus it appeareth, that you hold neither the *matter*, nor *forme* of the *Church* to be *spirituall* then, nor the *persons gracious*, but *ungracious*, *fleshly*, and *carnall*. But the Scripture teacheth us, that they were *a holy nation, and a peculiar people* unto the *Lord their God*; and so excellent, that none were like unto them; *Great advantage had they every manner of way: Unto them was committed the Oracles of God.* And shall wee thinke, that *God* committed his *Oracles* to a *Church* which had a *carnall constitution*? or that he owned such for his *holy peculiar people*? *God* made an *everlasting covenant* with *Abraham*, that he would be a *God unto him and his seed for ever*: And though the *Law was added*, *because of transgression*, yet it *could not disanull the covenant*, and therefore not the *Church* (or *people* of the *covenant*), or the *seale* of the *promise*. Now surely, if that the *Church* had been *constituted* upon *nature corrupted*, (such as you have opposed to *grace*) and upon the *naturall*, & not upon the *spirituall seed**, then there was no difference between the *Israelites*, and the *Heathens*; and then was the Church of *Israel*, no communion of *Saints*, but a mixt multitude, which to thinke is very erronious, as may appeare by these Scriptures, *Exod.* 10. 5, 6. & 22. 31. & 12. 48, 49. *Num.* 9. 14 & 15. 15. *Levit.* 19. 2. & 20. 7, 8. *Deut.* 7. 6. & 14. 1, 2. & 16. 18, 19. 1 *King.* 8. 53. *Deut.* 4. 20. & 29. 10, 11, 12, 13. & 10. 15. *Psal.* 147. 24.

But from this your groundlesse affirmation, you would (through an inference) make another disparitie, between the *Church* of the *Jewes*, and the *Church* of the *Gentiles*: You say, *That was therefore termed Israel according to the flesh, and of the circumcision of the flesh,* this

* *No man* (sayth Mr. *Spilsbery will admit of dead plants to be set in his vineyard, or grafted into a stock, but onely such as are capable to comply with the same, in the sap, and nourishment thereof, to the end it may grow, and bring forth fruit: and so it is with Christ, who comes not short of nature, and therefore he admits not of any dead plants to be set in his spirituall vineyard, or dead members to be joyned to his mysticall body, but onely such as by faith are capable to comply with the head. Neither tooke he for himselfe a compounded body, consisting of both living & dead members, which all are that have not a living principle of grace, &c.* For this see his *Treat.* of *Bap.* *pag.* 20. *lin.* 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14.

* See before in this *Treatise* pag. 29, 30, 31. For there it is answered at large.

this *Israel according to the Spirit*, and of the *circumcision of the heart*, *Rom.* 8. 28, 29. *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Gal.* 2. 11. And to this I answer. That your speech doth here import, as if none who were *Israel* according to the *flesh*, were *Israelites* according to the *spirit*: but the Apostle sayth, *All are not Israel that are of Israel*. He maketh a manifest difference between *Israel* the *Church of God*, and those who were not really *Israelites*, though they came of *Israels* loynes according to the *flesh*. But your speech crosseth the *Apostles* speech, and tendeth to prove, that all were *Israel* that were of *Israel*. But what will you say to the *Proselytes*, and their *seed*? Were they *Israel* according to the *flesh*? Surely they were not; therefore they were *Israelites* according to the *spirit*? As well as others, who were also *Israelites*, both according to the *spirit*, and *flesh*.

Moreover, None were to be *circumcised* externally in the *flesh*, but those who were in *Gods covenant*, and were *circumcised in heart*, so farre as men could discerne; and those that were in *Gods covenant*, were *Israelites spiritually*, and so to be esteemed, even as *true members* of the *Church*. So *David* sayth, *Yet surely God is good unto Israel, unto those that are pure in heart*. *Circumcision* of the *flesh* sealed unto them the *circumcision* of the *heart*; and this *God* promised both to *them* and *their seed*, and then both *male*, and *female*, were all one in *Christ*[a], and so they are now[a].

Deut. 30. 6.
[a] Exod. 12. 48, 49.
Num. 9. 14. & 15. 14, 15, 16.
[a] Gal. 3. 28.

As for the *Scriptures* (*Rom.* 2. 28, 29. *Rom.* 9. 6, 7, 8. *Gal.* 2. 11.) which you cite, they make nothing for your present purpose, to prove, *That that was* [*onely*] *called Israel according to the flesh, and the other onely according to the spirit; The one constituted upon that* [*nature*] (*which you have opposed to grace*) *& upon the naturall seed* (*destitute of the spirit,*) *the other constituted on grace* (*without nature,*) *and the spirituall seed of Abraham* (*without the naturall seed*) Prove this, and then you say something, else it is nothing to your purpose.

But indeed the substance of what you say heer, is answered at large in this Treatise, *pag.* 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.

And now I will proceed to examine the *Scriptures* which you have cited heer, for confirmation of these your opinions.

As touching *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. there the *Apostle* declareth who are the true *Jewes* indeed, (namely) those that are *Jewes* inwardly; and that the *true Circumcision* indeed, is that of the *heart*, in the *spirit*, not in the *letter*, *whose praise is of God*, &c. Now will you reason from this place, that those who were the *naturall seed* (not degenerating) were not

not the *spirituall seed*? and that because *God* accepted of the *infants* with their *parents*, and commanded them to be *circumcised*, that therefore the *Church-state* was built upon *nature*, and not upon *Christ*! Surely you cannot gather any such thing from the *Apostles* words, in *Rom.* 2. 28, 29. nor from any other place of Scripture, but rather the contrary. Yea, the *Apostle* in the following Chapter declareth, that as for the *advantage* of *the Jew*, and the *profit* of *circumcision*, it *was much every manner of way, chiefly because that unto them were committed the Oracles of God: For* (sayth he) *what if some did not believe, shall their unbeliefe make the faith of God without effect? God forbid*: And so he concludeth, that both *Jewes* and *Gentiles* are *justified by faith, Seeing it is one God which shall justifie the circumcision by faith, and the uncircumcision through faith; Doe wee then make voyd the Law through faith?* (sayth he) *God forbid: yea, wee establish the Law.*

And in the fourth Chapter *Paul* treateth of *justification by faith without workes*; and expoundeth *Davids* speech; for whereas *David* sayth*, *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth not sinne, and in whose spirit there is no guile*. *Paul* explaineth it thus; *Blessed is the man to whom the Lord imputeth* [*righteousnesse without works*:] From which places of *Scripture*, much may be gathered against those who denie *infants* to have *faith imputatively*; for the *Apostle* declareth that *he to whom the Lord imputeth not sinne*, is a righteous person.

* Psal. 32. 1, 2.

Now every person is either *righteous*, or *unrighteous*; for as *righteousnesse* is not *imputed* unto those to whom *sinne* is *imputed*, So those whose *iniquities* are *pardoned*, and their *sinne covered*, the *Lord* (*imputing no sinne unto them*) he *imputeth righteousnesse* unto them, [*without workes*,] and this *righteousnesse*, is that which *justifieth* before *God*. It was *faith* which *was counted unto Abraham for righteousnesse*. And so he proceedeth in the 9th, 10th, and 11th *verses*, to prove, that this *blessing*, or *blessednesse* came not onely upon the *circumcision*, but also upon the *uncircumcision*, declaring that *Abraham* received not *circumcision* before hee had this *blessednesse*; wherefore he calleth *Circumcision a signe, and seale of the righteousnesse of faith, which he had before he was circumcised*; which importeth, that all those who were *circumcised* then (according to *Gods* appointment) were (in *visibilis*) *blessed* before, and had this *righteousnesse* before; even as all those who are *baptized*, according to *Gods* appointment, are *righteous* before, and have (in *visible* account) the same *blessing*, with those had, who were *circumcised*, according to the

tion revealed

revealed will of *God*. And he goeth on in the 13, 14, 15, *verses*, and there telleth us, who are the *right heires*. And in the 16th *verse*, he sayth, that *the promise is sure to all the seed, not to that onely which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham, who is the father of us all*. And he further sheweth, that this *promise* ([*so shall thy seed be*,] and that *Abrahams believing Gods promise*,) was *imputed* unto him for *righteousnesse*; and *was not written for his sake alone, but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if wee beleeve on God*. And then in *Rom*. 10. he sheweth, that the *Gospel* was *preached* by *Moses*, and was nigh unto *Israel, in their heart, and in their mouth*.

Touching your other *Scripture*, *Rom*. 9. 6, 7, 8. which you alledge to prove your former *position*, concerning the different constitutions of the *Church* of the *Jewes*, and of the *Church* of the *Gentiles*, it maketh nothing for your purpose neither; And because you shall see that it maketh not for you, but against you, therefore I will set down the words at large.

Those (sayth he) *that are after the flesh, doe minde the things of the flesh: but they that are after the spirit, the things of the spirit.* Ver. 6. *For to be carnally minded is death; but to be spiritually minded is life, and peace:* Ver. 7. *Because the carnall minde is enmitie against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be.* Ver. 8. *So then they that are in the flesh* (sayth he) *cannot please God.*

From whence wee may gather, that as those who doe not please God, are not spiritually minded, &c. so on the contrary, those that do please God, are *spiritually minded*, and *subject* to the *Law* of *God*, and are *heires* of *life*, and *children* of *light* and *peace*. But such were the *Israelites*; *God* was well *pleased* with them, and accepted of their *sacrifices*, and promised unto them, *remission* of their *sinnes* through *Jesus Christ*, who was then to come, and is now come. Therefore I would have you to banish such evill thoughts out of your minde, as if they had a *false*, *corrupt*, or *carnall*, and not a *spirituall constitution*.

Againe consider, That Church upon whom *holy Baptisme* was rightly administred, was *holy* and *spirituall*.

But *holy Baptisme* was rightly administred upon the Church of *Israel*. 1 Cor. 10. Psa. 77. 16.

Therefore they were a *holy spirituall* Church, as well as wee.

Much more may be sayd for this, but what hath been sayd, may suffice.

But peradventure you will say, you mean, that in their *Apostasie*

they pleased not *God*; and therefore their *Church-state* which they were in formerly, had a *carnall constitution*, and was not *spirituall*.

To which I answer, That the like you may say concerning the *Churches* now, which you acknowledge to be *spirituall*. But you should consider, that *many are called, but few are chosen*: *Gods garden* may have some *plants* therein, which possibly may degenerate from their kinds, and become *wilde*, yet the *garden* is still the *Lords*; but the *husband-men* ought when they discover such, to weed them out. So *corruptions* began to *spring* in the *Church* of *Corinth*, and they cut downe the *tender fruits* thereof in time. And *God* threatned the members of some of the *Churches* of *Asia*, to execute judgement upon them, if repentance prevented him not.

Cor. 7. 11.

Rev. 2. & 3.

As for *Coll.* 2. 11. which you have cited, that the *Church* of *Collossia*, *was circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sinnes of the flesh; by the circumcision of Christ*. This implyeth not but that the *Jewes* and *Proselytes* before *Christs* coming, had *circumcision* of the *flesh*, as an outward *signe* unto them, that the *Lord* would *circumcise* their *hearts*, and the *hearts* of their *seed*, to *love* him more and more, according to his *gracious promise*. And seeing that the *Apostle* maketh *circumcision* heer, the same in effect with our *Baptisme*, it plainly argueth, that as *infants* (in former time) were to receive *circumcision*, so *infants* now (in their *infancie*) are to receive *Baptisme*, the *seale* of the same *covenant*.

Whereas you say, *That was a state of bond men**, wherein an *heire* differed nothing from a *servant*, this, not of *servants**, but of *sonnes* and *free-men*. I suppose you mean by *bond men*, those who were *bound servants to Sathan*; and by *free-men*, those who were *set free by Christ*. In this respect then you have not done well, in saying that such a one that was made *free* (in this spirituall respect) differed nothing from those who were *visibly bond slaves of Sathan*. Then (it seemes) *Isaac* differed nothing from a *mocker*; nor the *Proselytes infants*, from *Heathens* and *Infidels*.

Lin. 23.

Lin. 28.

And if you mean, by *servants*, those who are *wicked* in the *Church*, I say, they were to be cast out, as they manifested *evill-fruits*; for though they were in the *house* a while, and were as *children*, yet they manifesting themselves afterwards to be *servants* of *sinne*, were no longer to abide; but those who are not *servants* of *sinne*, are now (as they were then) to abide for *ever* therein; so *Ishmael* was in *covenant* with *Isaac*, and was *circumcised*; but when he manifested *fruits*

of

of *unbelieffe*, out he was cast. And why was this? Not because he was *Abrahams seed*, according to the *flesh*; but because he manifested himself afterward to *be a servant of sinne*, and so degenerated from the righteous steps of *Abraham*. Gen. 21. 9.

Now you ought to know, that the *Church* of the *Jewes* was *constituted* of *free-men*, and there was not one *sinner* to be suffered in that *church*, but when he was discovered, either he must *repent*, or be cut off; therefore it plainly argueth, that visible wicked persons, *bond-slaves* of *Sathan*, were not to be the matter of that *Church*; in the first constitution, they were such who in all outward appearance, were not alliens from *Gods covenants*, or *promises*, or *strangers* to *God*, but were such whom he knew, and owned, and such whom he would acknowledge, as in the *kingdome* of *grace* heer; so in the *kingdome* of *glory* hereafter. See before

It may be you thinke thus; That *if the Church of Israel were constituted of free-men, why then were many of them manifested afterwards to be wicked? Corah, and his company, a congregation of Rebels, from whom Moses, and the rest were commanded to seperate; famous men, and men of renowne amongst the Israelites, and yet were chiefe in the rebellion; also* Nadab *and* Abihu, *offerers of strange fire, and many more, manifested themselves to be evill persons.*

Ans. If this be any ground of your prejudicate against the *Church* of the *Jewes*, then let this satisfie you, that these were *free-men* at first, according to *visibilitie*, as *holy* as *Judas*, or *Simon Magus*, or *Ananias* and *Saphira*; And therefore if it be an *argument* of a *false constitution*, for *members* of a *Church* of *God* to fall from their *stedfastnesse*, then it will follow, that the *Church* now (under the *Gospel*) hath not a true *constitution*, seeing that divers fall from their *stedfastnesse*, some for a time, like the *incestuous person* in the *Church* of *Corinth*, others, finally, totally, and eternally, like *Judas Iscariot*, who was one of the *Lambs twelve Apostles*.

Let this then be the conclusion, that the state may be a state of *free-men*, though some *bond-men* appeare in it, and are cast out, as *Ishmael* the *sonne* of the *bond-woman*, was cast out of the state of *free-men*, wherein the *infants* of *believers* were admitted, though they were not the *seed* of *Abraham* according to the *flesh*.

And the consideration of this maketh much for the *infants* of *believers* now; for as much as *believers* (even *free-men*) *priviledges* are much enlarged since *Christs* manifestation in the *flesh*. The *free-men*

had this *priviledge* formerly to bring in their *infants*, and to difference them from those without: And surely their *priviledges* are not lessened now: * *Christ* came not to bring *losse* and *damnage* to *holy infants*; And if it be true, wch you say, *That till Christs coming, an heire (or beleever) differed nothing from a servant.* If by a *servant*, you mean *Ishmael*, or such as he, who manifested themselves to be *servants of sinne*, then why was the son of the *bond-woman* cast out, & differenced from the sonne of the *free-woman*? But indeed you should minde, that *Christ* came to take the *yoake* of the *Law* from the *shoulders* of *beleevers*, and so to ease them of that *servitude*, under which they were; and this doth not impaire the *infants* of *beleevers*, no not in the *least*.

Touching *Christs* discourse *, which you bring to make your assumations to appeare *evident true*; It doth evidence, that your affirmations in this *particular*, are *evident false*; for *Christ* sayth no such thing which you faine, that he saith; for he speaketh to those that did derogate from the *steps* of *Abraham*, which the *beleevers Infants* could not justly be said to doe. And *Christ* doth not say, that the *Church* of the *Jewes* was constituted upon *nature*, *flesh*, *carnalitie*, opposite to the *spirit*; but he sayth, that those that continued in his *Word*, they then were his *Disciples* indeed, & should know the *truth*, and the *truth* should make them *free*; (not that the *Church*, whereof he and his brethren were members, was evilly *constituted*, because evill persons were in it, or degenerated from it) but that these were *members* in the *Church*, which had need to amend, or else to be *cast out*.

What had the *Infants* of *beleeving parents* done, to deserve *Excommunication* (or *casting* out of the *Church*?) if they had don nothing worthy of it (as it is sure they had not) then I may justly conclude, that they were not *children* of the *bond-woman*, and if not of the *bond-woman*, then still of the *free-woman*, and if *children* of the *free-woman*, then *members* of the *Church*, and if so, then there is no just reason can be given to debarre such *holy Infants* of their *priviledges*; amongst which, *Baptisme* is one, as *Circumcision* was of *old*. Lin. 30.

* John 8.

Their answer to *Christ* was, that they were *Abrahams seed*, and so were *free alcadie, and were never in bondage to any man.* But in this they said not *true*; for they had degenerated from the steps of *Abraham*. And *Christ* in telling them, that *whosoever committeth sinne, is the servant of sinne*; did therein declare, that it was no benefit unto any to be of *Abrahams seed*, if they degenerated from *Abrahams steps*; for this was a means, (though they were *members* of the true *Church*) to make them no *members* of it, but to be cast out thence; for (so sayth *Christ* unto them,) *the servant abideth not in the house for ever.* Now by this *house*, is meant his *Church*; In which though *sinners* abide covertly (for a time) yet as they manifest themselves to be *corrupt*,

rupt, and *leavenous*, are (or at leaſt ought) to be *caſt* out; Therefore they abide not there *for ever*; So the *Jewes* were taught by the *ceremony* of caſting away *leaven*, to caſt out the *leaven* of *ſinne*, out of their *hearts*, and out of their *families*; and alſo to *purge* the *Church* of *God*, both of *ſinne*, and *ſinners*, ſo far as they could diſcerne by the *light* of *Gods Word*, But thoſe that were *true Saints*, were to abide in that *true Church-ſtate for ever*. So it is ſaid, *Pſal.* 15. 5. That ſuch ſhall *never be moved out of Gods Tabernacle, and holy Mountaine*. So *Chriſt* ſayth heer, that *the Sonne abideth for ever*; *If therefore the Sonne make you free, you ſhall be free indeed*. By this *freedome*, he meant a *freedome* from condemnation for ever, from the *law* of *ſinne*, and of *death* for ever, becauſe he oppoſeth it to the *bondage* they were in.

Further, Theſe perſons whom *Chriſt* reprehended, were not obedient to the *new covenant*, neither did they regard the *commandements* of the *Law*; for the *commandement* ſayth, *Thou ſhalt not* kill. But *Chriſt* ſayd unto them; I know you are *Abrahams ſeed, but yee ſeek to kill me, becauſe my Word hath no place in you, &c.* This *wickedneſſe* of theirs, was not warranted, neither by the *new*, nor *old covenant*, and therefore they were not allowed in any reſpect, but condemned. Wherefore it evidently appeareth, that you cannot gather from either of the *covenants*, that ſuch viſible wicked perſons, were by *God* allowed to be in (much leſſe the *ground* of) his *Churches conſtitution* after their diſcovery. Theſe then were not meet to be *members* of the *Church* of the *Jewes*, yea, though they were the *children* of *Abraham* (according to the *fleſh*) yet by the *new* and *old covenant*, were to be *caſt* out, when the *leaſt infant* of a *faithfull Proſelyte*, remained ſtill a *member of the Common-wealth of Iſrael*, which was the *Church* of *God*.

Moreover, *Chriſt* did not affirme any ſuch thing (as you would further faine he did,) that perſons by *naturall birth*, and *circumciſion* of the *fleſh*, were admitted *free*; for *Iſhmaelites* and *Edomites*, by *fleſhly generation*, were the *children* of *Abraham*, yet they were not therefore admitted *free-men*, till they renounced their *parents ſinne*, and came into the Church. And the *infants* of wicked *parents*, were *circumciſed* in *Apoſtacie*; yet wee will not ſay, that therefore they were *free*; But this wee are to know, that the *naturall ſeed* of the *faithfull*, that were *not apoſtated*, or *degenerated*, were to be accounted the *true ſeed*; and all thoſe who were *circumciſed*, according to *Gods* appointment, were the *true ſeed* in *covenant* with *God*, and ſo were made *free*; when *Apoſtates* (though *circumciſed*) were *bond ſervants to ſinne*, and Gen. 17. 14.

were not to be admitted (as they ſtood in that ſtate of *Apoſtacie*) to be *members* of the *Church* of the *Iewes*, as you moſt fainedly would *father* upon *Chriſt*.

You fain as if *Chriſt* ſhould ſay, that *Abrahams* nature could produce no other but *ſervants of ſinne, &c.* But I know not what you meane hereby. I know *Abraham* was a *ſinner* in the *loynes* of *Adam*, yet *Adams ſinne* was not imputed unto him to condemnation; no more was it viſibly to *Abrahams ſeed*, but as they degenerated from *Abrahams ſteps*; for the *ſinne* of *Abraham*, which he had *actually*, and *originally*, was forgiven him in *Chriſt*.

And thinke not, that he was deſtitute of the *new covenant*, for though the *new covenant* was before the manifeſtation of the *old covenant* in *Mount Sinai*, yet it was *new* in reſpect of *perpetuitie*, though *old* in reſpect of *antiquitie*; & is ſet forth in *Rev.* 4. by the *ſimilitude* of a *Rainbow, in ſight like an Emerauld round about the throne of God.*

And the *Infants* of *Abraham* were never out of the *Church ſtate*, till they *apoſtated* & *degenerated* from the ſteps of *Abraham*; If the *promiſes* had been made to *ſeeds, as of many*, then there had been ſome ground to *beleeve*, that *viſible wicked perſons*, or perſons *meerly naturall* deſtitute of the *ſpirit*, were fit matter for the conſtitution of that *Church*, and that the *ſeed* of *Apoſtates* might be *circumciſed*, as well as others.

[a] Gal. 3. 16. But the promiſes were made onely to one *ſeed*[a], namely, *Chriſt*, that is to ſay, *Chriſts body*, which conſiſteth (or ought to conſiſt) *viſibly* of none but *ſonnes* of *God*, by *faith* in *Chriſt*. And ſeeing the *promiſe* made to *Abraham*, and his *ſeed*, was not made through the *Law*, (namely, the *old Law*) and that this *old Law* could not diſannull the *promiſe*, therefore the *old covenant* could be removed, and yet the *promiſe* continue ſtill, to all thoſe *ſeeds* to whom it was made.

See *A. R.* Pag. 24. li. 1, 2. Mat. 1. Luk. 3. Iſa. 11. But further you would faine, that the *fleſh* ſpoken of in *Gen.* 17. 13. was *Chriſt, who was to come of their fleſh*. But you ſhould know, that *Chriſt* came of the *Tribe* of *Iudah*, by lineall deſcent, and not of the reſt of the *Tribes*, nor of the father-*Proſelytes*, and yet they being *circumciſed*, that *covenant* of *circumciſion* was in them *fleſh*.

[a] Luk. 2. 21. Moreover, *Chriſt* himſelfe was *circumciſed* [in his [a]] where was that *covenant*, if he were the *fleſh* ſpoken of? The *covenant* was in his *fleſh*, as well as in the *fleſh* of his *brethren*. Now by *fleſh*, we may, and ought to underſtand, that place from whence the *ſuperfluitie of their forreſkinne* was *cut off*. *My covenant* ſaith he, *ſhall be in* [*your*] *fleſh*; *and the uncircumciſed man-childe, whoſe* [*fleſh of*

Gen. 17. 10. Ver. 14.

his

his foreskin] *is not cut off, the same person shall be cut off, &c.*

Againe, If by the *flesh*, was onely meant *Christs naturall body*, and by the *covenant*, onely the *circumcision*, which *Christ* was to receive, (and did receive) in his *flesh*. Then *circumcision* was abolished, (or at an end) when *Christ* was *circumcised*, and none were to be *circumcised* after him.

Yea, and if he were that *flesh*, which was to be *circumcised*; then it will follow, that though none other had been *circumcised* before or after, they had not broken the *covenant*.

But *God* did declare, *What the circumcision* was, and *where* it was to be *administred*, and upon *whom*: First, It was a *cutting off*. of the *superfluous fore-skinne*: Secondly, That it was to be *in their flesh*, and not in the *flesh* of *others* in stead of them. Thirdly, That it was to be administred upon *Jewes* and *Gentiles*, that were in the *covenant*: And so such persons were by *vertue* of *Gods covenant circumcised*, not onely before *Christ* was *circumcised*, but also after; and therefore you have not done well to interpret *Gen.* 17. 13 after such a *manner*, & you have done *evill*, in fayning it, as if it were the speech of *Christ*, when no such things ever entered into his thoughts. Gen. 17. Exod. 12. 48.

Whereas you think *circumcision* was a *covenant* properly, you should know, that though *circumcision* had the denomination of *Gods covenant* [a], yet it was but a *signe* of it [b]. The *names* of things signified (in the Scripture) are given to the *signes*, which signifie them; So the *Lambe* was called *Gods Passeover* [c]; the *Rock*, *Christ* [d]; the *bread* and *wine* in the *Lords Supper*, *Christs body* and *blood*, *&c.* [e] And in this sense, is *circumcision* called *Gods covenant*, that is to say, a *token*, or *signe* thereof, as *God* termeth it himselfe in *Gen.* 17. *ver.* 11.

a Gen. 14. 10.
b Ver. 11.
c Exod. 12. 11.
d 1 Cor. 10. 4.
e Mat. 26. 26.

As for those which say, that the *promise*, *covenant*, *election*, *and faith*, *belongeth to* [all] *beleevers children* (which supposed case you put *to shut up all* your matter) I tell you, that if by all, they mean the *godly children* of *godly parents*, then they say true; But that the *wicked children* of *godly parents*, have these excellent things belonging unto them, is no *article* of my *faith*. When the Apostle *Peter* sayth to the *Jewes*; *The promise is unto* (you, *and to*) [*your children*,] *and to all that are afar off*, *even as many as the Lord our God shall call*. In including the *children* heer with the *parents*, his meaning is not to include all *beleevers children*, but onely those *holy ones* who abide in their *parents righteous steps*; which thing holy *Infants* doe, as before hath been proved at large [a], they do not degenerate from the *righteous steps* of their *holy parents*.

* See *A.* 2. Pag. 25. at lin. 8.

Act. 2. 39.

a See pag. 3.

parents. And therefore such may be lawfully *baptized*, for no more in effect is required to *Baptisme*, then was to *circumcision* of old; this is, as that was, and these are, as those were: *Holy infants* were to be *circumcised* then, and therefore such may be lawfully *baptized* now.

* See *A. R.* Pag. 25. li. 19.

Next, you * charge *the great Clerkes of our times, with confounding the two Covenants, of the Law and Gospel together*. And to this, I say, if by these *great clerkes*, you mean those who thinke *Infants Baptisme* to be a *meer tradition*; Indeed then your accusation may prove true upon them, for such as they doe put no difference between the *new covenant*, made with *Abraham* and his *seed*, and the *old covenant* and *law*, which came long after it; but they thinke this *new covenant*, and the *old covenant*, to be both one, and doe not rightly understand the *nature* of them; and therefore the *hodge-podge in their teachings, and writings*, which you mention*, is their owne, as well as any ones else; as also *the intermixture of grace and workes, truth and errour*; as also *the distillation of the spirit of giddinesse into the hearts of their hearers, that they walke indeed* (as you speak*) *in a circular Maze: And so by confounding Law and Gospel*, have laboured to bring you (or rather detaine you) *in bondage to sinne*.

* Lin. 29.

* Lin. 33.

Next, You would make us beleeve, that you desire that *the doctrine of free grace by Jesus Christ, might be set forth distinctly in its native lustre, and the spiritualitie thereof in its fulnesse of beautie and glory clearly layd open*. Which is indeed a thing to be desired, both in the continuance and encrease thereof. But alas, little doe you thinke (as I in charitie judge) how all your labour in this Treatise, tendeth to the darkening, obscuring, eclipsing, restraining, and limitting of the *doctrine of free grace by Jesus Christ*, the *distinct displaying* of whose *native lustre*, though it be never so often done, or the *spiritualitie* thereof in its *fulnesse* of *beautie* and *glory*, never so clearly layd open before you, yet you cannot see it clearly indeed, so long as you thus hudwinke the eyes of your charitie, and present the *blessed babes* of *beleeving parents*, unto you, and your selfe unto them, in such *beastly* shapes, as you have don throughout your discourse cōcerning them.

See *A. R.* pag. 26. at lin. 16.

You talk freely of *free grace*, as if it were excellent in your eyes, and that you desire to be satisfied with the fulnes of the beautie thereof; But in the mean while, you would not have us thinke that any part thereof belongeth to the *holy infants*: But surely (as I layd before *) it is well they are not at your finding; for if they were, it seemeth that

* See before in this Treatise, pag. 12.

that you would (*Dives*-like) not admit them the leaſt crum which falleth from your *Table*. But our *ſtrong Saviour Jeſus Chriſt*, who was once an *infant*, and is (and alwayes was) *the onely begotten Sonne of God, full of grace and truth*, hath *free grace* enough in store for them, and hath *diſplayed* the ſame excellently in its *native luſtre*, as is frequently manifeſted in the *Scripture* of God. Which thing no doubt you will perceive, when once *God* openeth your eyes to see how the *covenant* of *mercy* is made with *believing parents*, and their *ſeed*, that he will be their *God* and will accept of them in *Chriſt*, (binding them to do nothing above their abilitie.) And this *free grace* of *God* ariſeth from his *love* and *kindneſſe*, or *good will* which he hath unto them, and alwayes had, which kinde mind moved him to look upon them with the eye of pittie, and to take ſuch his choſen ones to himſelfe. And this grace may well be ſaid to be free, and why? Becauſe it proceedeth not from workes, but from the love of *God* in *Chriſt Jeſus*. The love which is in God, is that which moveth God, (who is love) to love; *Becauſe He loved thy fathers, therefore He choſe their ſeed.* So the *covenant* of *free grace* runs thus; *I will be the God of thee, and of thy ſeed after thee*: And he bindeth the *holy infants* to no action, or any thing which they cannot do, but giveth them the true *bleſſednesſe* without *workes*. And therefore though you talke never ſo long of *free grace*, and toſſe it never ſo often in your mouth, yet it is no freedome for you, but bondage unto you, ſo long as you doe (by with-ſtanding *holy infants*) as it were, ſnatch their bread out of their mouths. The ground whereof is your *unbeliefe*, becauſe you perſwade your ſelfe, that the *holy infants* are not viſibly in the *ſtate of ſalvation*, till they *actually* and *verbally* expreſſe *faith*. As if the *believers infants* [*dying* in their *infancie*] were not *ſaved* by *Chriſts righteouſneſſe*, *imputed* unto them without *Workes*. And your own *errour* (as you mention) which *like hypocrites crocodiles, doe ſmile and weep, ſtand and fall together*, may be juſtly *fathered* upon thoſe, who barre out the *infants* from the ſaid *priviledges* which *Chriſt* hath bequeathed unto them, as they are ſelected unto him.

Deut. 4. 37. Gen. 17. 7.

As for the *Liturgie* which you mention, (meaning thoſe of the *Church* of *England*, as I ſuppoſe) which you now run upon, (as you did at the later end of your firſt booke,) though it be to little purpoſe, (for as much as it doth not concerne our poynt in hand,) yet I will tell you what I know, and have found by

Pag. 25.

experience, that they are faine to betake themſelves to *Anabap-*

ristical Arguments, both for the *maintenance* of their *state*, and retaining of will persons therein; which indeed ariseth from their grosse mistake of the *Historie* of the *Scripture*, thinking (as you doe) that the *Church* of the *Jewes* was constituted meerly upon *nature* and *carnalitie*, and the like stuffe, never considering that *God* (from the *beginning* of the *world*) alwayes constituted his *Church* onely of such persons, who in all *visible* account were *faithfull*, and *holy*; And still provided a way and means to *purge* the *Church* from *corruptions*.

Moreover, The parties (formerly specified) in maintenance of their *state*, have also a *fond* erronious conceipt, that because they have some of *Gods ordinances*, therefore they are a true *Church*; not considering that *Gods ordinances* may be in a *false state*, as in *Jeroboams Whorish Church*, (as hath been observed formerly **.) Hereupon they are forceably driven, either to *confesse* the *Church* of *Rome*, to be a *true Church*, or else to maintaine that an *unbaptized* person may *baptize*. Now if they stand to denie the *baptisme* in the *Church* of *Rome*, they denie their owne *Baptisme*, which they received successively from thence; which if they doe, (as upon your grounds they are driven thereunto) then how doe you thinke they will raise *baptisme*, except an *unbaptized* person *baptize* another?

** See the Answer to *A. R.* first part.

Thus you may see into what streits they wrap and ensnare themselves, in taking up such groundlesse *Arguments* as you bring, and all to justifie themselves in their own way, and to avoyd, and withstand the way of *Seperation*, which is the onely *way* of *God*.

Whereas you bring in the *disorders* in *worship* & *government*, which you say, the *Papists* have brought in; I tell you, this is a varying from the matter in hand, yet I say, we ought to learne by the same to avoyd them, and all those who seek to *ruinate* the *foundation* of *Christian Religion*, by casting *darke shadowes* upon the *heavenly beautie* and *glorious excellencie*, of *Christs Kingly*, *Priestly*, and *Prophetical office*, and *eclipse* his *Mediatorship*, as if it were lesse then it was before he was manifested in the *flesh*. As if he who hath all *power* both in *heaven* and in *earth*, hath not given so much *authoritie*, as generally and universally to make *Disciples*, and *baptize* them; as the *Saints* of old had to make *Disciples* and *circumcise* them; Surely seeing *Christ* is as faithfull in his *house* as *Moses*. As the *Gaspel* of *Christ* (in former time) was so effectuall and *powerfull*, as to cause *Proselytes* (and their *seed* in their *infancie*) to have such dignitie (by *vertue* of *Gods covenant*) to be

be *circumcised*; The *Gospel* of *Christ* (being every jot as glorious as it hath been,) is also as effectuall and powerfull now, to dignifie *beleevers*, and their *infants*, with the *ordinance* of *Baptisme*; and that by vertue of *Gods covenant*; unto which is annexed *Christs passion*, which is very *generall*, yea more *generall* than *circumcision* was of *old*. And surely if the *infants* of *beleevers* had that *power*, as to be one the *children* of *God* in their *infancie*, fellow-*heires* with the *Saints* in *light*, as *Isaac* was, and all those like him were, and to be *co-heires* with *Jesus Christ*, of the *everlasting inheritance*, *kingdome*, and *glory*, and that before *Christs resurrection*; Then the *infants* of *beleevers*, borne after *Christs resurrection*, have the like *priviledges*. But the *first* is true from the *grounds* before layd, from their *right* to the *covenant*, their being in the *covenant*, *&c.* and the unchangeablenesse of the *Angel* of the *covenant*. Therefore the latter, that *holy infants* are still in the *covenant*, is true also; And this hath been sufficiently proved before.

Touching your Exhortation, how wee should bewaile the great *Apostacie*, *&c.* I say, as the *Saints* of *old* did bewaile the great *Apostacie* of the *Israelites*, both in *faith* and *worship*, who were *replenished from the East, and were south-sayers, like the Philistians, and pleased themselves in the children of strangers*; So wee ought to bewaile this *Apostacie* of these now. Isa. 2. 6.

Wee have cause to bewaile their *ignorance*, who pretend *holinesse* to *God*, and make a *verball profession*, drawing neer unto *God* with their *mouthes* (like the *Apostate Israelites*) when their *hearts* are far from him; pleading for the *baptizing* of those *Infants*, whose *parents* are neither of them *beleevers*, causing the *holy signe* to be *administred* upon their *infants* in that *idolatrous estate*; in the partaking whereof, they have no *right*, any more then the *seed* of those *Apostates* of the *Israelites*, had *right* to *circumcision* in former time.

But yet though the *Infants* were *circumcised* in that *Idolatrous estate*, the *Prophets* worke was to call them to *repentance*, and if they returned (the manner of their *circumcision* being repented of) it was as effectuall unto them, as if they had received it in an excellent and *holy manner*. So those who are *baptized* in their *infancie*, in the *state* of *Apostacie*, at their conversion are not to be *baptized* againe; but to repent of the *evill* of the *manner*, and not cast away *Gods holy institution*, but still retaine it, and make *a holy use* of it, yet they ought not to *Idolize* it, by preferring it before that which is greater. Though the

Lev. 2. 1, 2. *Temple*, and the *Altar*, and the *worshippers*, were to be *measured*, yet the *Court* without was to be cast out, *and not to be measured, because it was given to the Gentiles.*

Againe, Whereas you speak of the *abrogation* of the *state* of the *Jewes*. I say, This hath been answered fully before, you should still minde that *Jesus Christ* came not to *undermine* or *overthrow* his *kingdome*, though it was *taken out of the hands of the unbeleeving Jewes, and given unto another people*, whom *Christ* testified, *would bring forth fruits of it.*

Againe, Whereas you speak of the casting off of *Israel*, according to the *flesh*.

I answer, That none were cast off meerly because they were *Israelites* according to the *flesh*; and though some were cut off, yet others remained on, and in that state where the *Gentiles* by *faith* were *planted* and *placed*; as some of the *Jewes*, through *unbeliefe*, were cut off, *supplanted*, and *displaced*. So the *Apostle Paul* sayth, the *Jewes* some of them (not all of them) were cut off, because of *unbeliefe*, and the *beleeving Gentiles* grafted in their stead. As for those that *beleeved*, their *priviledges* and *prerogatives* were still as great, and as large, both to them, and their *seed*, as they were before. And the like may be sayd concerning the *Proselytes*. And so your other question is resolved, concerning the bringing in of us *Gentiles*, and our *seed*, as acceptable on *Gods Altar*.

And whereas you question againe;

A. R. *Whether the parents, Jew and Gentile, must needs be borne againe of the Spirit, and onely by faith become the seed of Abraham, and heires according to promise*, Gal. 3. 7. 29. Rom. 4. 11, 12. *And shall their children become the same seed by nature?*

I answer. The *birth of the Spirit* is very necessary both to *young* and *old*, without which they cannot enter into the *kingdome of heaven*. And I would have you to know, that I plead not that the *children* of the *faithfull* become *heires* of the *promise* by *nature*; but by the *free grace* of *God*, which *passeth all understanding*; which is as sufficient for *beleevers*, and their *children* now, as formerly.

And these interrogations of yours, are answered at large, you having mentioned the same things before.

Againe, You say;

A. R. *Neither can any shew any one such promise to any beleever, in all the whole world, and his seed, as was and is to Abraham and his seed, who is*

therefore.

therefore the father of us all, to wit) of all beleevers, and onely of beleevers, Jew and Gentile, father and childe, &c. Rom. 4. 16. *and therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; but the promise is sure onely to beleevers; Therefore beleevers onely are the seed of Abraham, to whom the promise and ordinance of the new Testament doe properly appertaine.*

To which I answer, That this hath been answered before already, It hath been proved sufficiently, that the same *covenant* which was made with *Abraham* and his *seed*, is made to *beleevers* and their *seed*; & it being a perpetuall *covenant*, the *heires* of it are perpetuall *heires*, even such to whom the *promises* doe appertaine, as well as unto their deare brethren of old, who are departed in the same faith; and this *heavenly* order the *old Law* which was given at *Mount Sinai*, could not disanull.

And I hope there is no reasonable man, but will condescend unto this, that all those who were to receive the *signe* and *seale* of the *righteousnesse* of *faith*, were *visibly holy* and *faithfull*; but the *Infants* of *beleevers* were, by *Gods* appointment, to receive the *signe*, and *seale* of the *righteousnesse* of *faith*; therefore the *Infants* of *beleevers* were then (as they are now) *visibly holy*, and *faithfull*. And *Christian Infants* are as *capable* (every way) of the *seale* now, as the *Infants* of the *Jewes* (*Gods* holy ones) were *capable* of the *seale* in former time.

Therefore the *Baptisme* of the *New Testament*, doth properly appertaine unto such; and therefore the administration of *Baptisme* upon them, doth not overthrow the least part of the *Gospel* of *Christ*, or any thing of his, much lesse the whole, as you (in your following words) most falsly speake; and therefore the *minor* of your following argument, being so small, that there is no truth therein; the conclusion builded thereon, (that that *Baptisme* * is *Antichristian* and *abominable*) is *Antichristian* and *abominable*, as well as your *comparisons*, specified in your first Book, where you compare the *Baptisme* of *Infants* with the *abominable Hierarchy*. Against which imprecations, I must, and will still, as I have done, maintaine the *Baptisme* of *holy Infants* to be *just* and *lawfull*, *holy* and *Evangelicall*; and ought to be observed, according to the *command* of *Christ*. Mat. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 16. Of which sufficient hath been spoken before, and more may be according as time and occation shall be offered.

* Pag. 30. l. 2

But your bare affirmations, (without proofe) you take for granted to be very true, and therefore upon this ground, you proceed to make a finall conclusion of your Booke, with this Conclusion;

A. R. his last Conclusion.

That the Baptisme of Infants, is the greatest delusion, and a thing of as dangerous consequence, as ever the Man of sinne brought into the World; and therefore the greatest maintainers thereof, are justly to be esteemed the greatest deluders. Wherefore it is high time for us to look about us, to awaken out of this drunken slumber, and to see how hitherto wee and our fathers have been blindly led, by our blind guides, into this depth of ignorance, and mist of iniquitie, and let us seek out by what meanes, and by whom wee are so miserably intoxicated, as to stumble and grope for our way, thus even at noone day.

To which I answer, That it is not materiall or sufficient to say, it is a *delusion*, except it could be proved to be so; you should know, that it is not a *delusion*, nor dangerous in the *least*, much lesse can it be the *greatest delusion, and of as dangerous consequence, as ever the Man of sinne brought into the World*; as you (without so much as any *just consequence*) most unjustly conclude; rather wee may conclude, that the greatest with-standers of *holy Infants Baptisme*, are the greatest deluders; Wherefore I may better conclude against you, that you have done very evill in uttering forth such *bitter words*, against the *Baptisme* of *holy Infants*, before you had seen the *premisses* better weighed in the Ballance of the *Sanctuary*. And why is it? but because you doe not look upon things with a single eye. Yea, *your spirituall sight* is so *darkened*, (or rather that *naturall reason* which is in you,) that in pushing at *Gods people*, you push against *God*, who standeth between you and us; though you (rideing upon the insufficiency of your humane testimony, which will not beare you out,) see him not, no more then blinde *Balaam* saw the *Angel* of *Jehovah*, that fought against him; But when your *eyes* are opened, then you shall see your *errour*, and be inabled to perceive a difference *spiritually* between the *Infants* of *beleevers*, and the *Infants* of *unbeleevers*, in respect of a *visible state*, and reverence the *ordinance* of *Baptisme*, administred upon *holy Infants*, for his sake, who is the Author and Instituter thereof; and no more condemne the *generation* of the *just*, who practise the same; and so *kick* against the *pricker*, and be a fighter (as you are now) against *God*. But know, that it is no better then *sacriledge*, to *father Gods holy Institutions* upon the *Man of sinne*.

And seing the *signe* & *seale* of the *righteousnes* of *faith*, was commanded by *God* to be *imposed* upon the *Infants* of *beleevers*, we may justly conclude, That those are deluded by *sinne*, which say it is a *delusion* of the *Man of sinne*; but such prejudicate *opinions*, as yours are, are the very

very *suggestions* of *Sathan*; for with the same *carnall reason* did he possesse *Eve*; & with the like *suggestions* hath he violently possessed you; this being as bad as that, if not *worse*; and therefore those who are *most active* and famous to withstand the *Baptisme* of *holy Infants*, are (if you will have it) *the greatest and most grossest deluders*, at least (and at the best) they are *deluded*.

And if you will still determine to hold on, as you have done, saying that the *Baptisme* of *Infants* is a *meer device*, and *tradition* of *man*, and brought into the *world* for *politick* and *by-ends*, *&c.* when it is apparently knowne, that *God* first brought it into the *World*; and his *love* is not *selfe-love*, neither hath he *any* other *ends*, but his *own glory*, and the good of *his people*. I say, if you hold on in your peremptory *conclusion*, that it is a *delusion* of the *Man of sinne*, and that the greatest *maintainers* thereof, are *justly* to be esteemed the *greatest deluders*. I must (knowing you to be *deluded*) desire you to *awake* out of this [your] *drunken slumber*; and know, that in all these your fond imaginations, & vain conceptions, you have brought forth a meer *dream*; When you awake (I hope) you will not finde it so.

AND now for conclusion, I desire you seriously to consider the Scriptures, reasons, and arguments brought by mee to vindicate the lawfulnesse of the Baptisme *of* holy Infants, *against whatsoever objections you have heer set downe in opposition of this Truth. And withall take notice (I pray you) how that throughout both these your Treatises against* Infants baptisme, *you have not brought one Scripture, from whence wee may draw the least consequence for dismissing the* holy Infants *from being members of* Gods visible church, *or for keeping them from* Baptisme (*the visible sign of the new* Covenant,) *extant now, any more then such* holy Infants *were exempted in former time from* Circumcision *the visible sign of the new* Covenant,) *extant then. But many, yea, multitudes of plaine and evident testimonies there are, evidently declaring the excellent benefits which appertaine unto them in* Jesus Christ; *Amongst which,* Baptisme *is one, which though it be externall, and is not effectuall [of it selfe] to the salvation of any, yet it is a sign (or token) by which* God *will have all his* visible Saints, marked *out for the* peculiar sheep *of his owne* pasture.

And if holy Infants *were not to be* baptized, *as* holy Infants *formerly were to be circumcised before* Christ *was manifested in the*

flesh,

flesh, when it would argue a great weaknes, or imperfection in Christ, *eclipsing his* Mediatorship, *as if he were not so able to make this as profitable unto these (in their* infancie*) as* Circumcision *was unto the other (in their* infancie*) importing as if* Christ *were not so faithfull in his* house, *as* Moses, *and as if* Baptisme *were of smaller value, and of lesse effect then* Circumcision.

But Baptisme *is as generall and as effectuall every manner of way as* Circumcision, *therefore as* Circumcision *was not worne out from the* Infants *of* beleevers, *but was so permanent, that it remained till* Christs *first coming, and till he took away the* Ceremonies *of the* old Law; *so* Baptisme *hath not, nor shall not be taken away from these, but remaine as permanent with them, till* Christ *(who was once an* Infant *like them) come againe in the Clouds of heaven, with* power *and* great glory, *descending with his shouting Troopes of heavenly Hosts; When the* heavens *from above, and* hell *from beneath, shall be emptied of those immortall soules and spirits which are therein, when your owne eyes shall behold our* Emanuel, *either to your* glory, *or* confusion; *at which time, all the dead both small and great,* Infants *as well as others, shall be seen to stand before* God *to be judged; Then shall there be a* seperation *between the* precious, *and the* vile; *when* Jesus Christ, *our sweet* Saviour, (the very beautie of holinesse, *the* brightnesse of his Fathers glory, *and the* expresse image of his person) *shall invite the* blessed babes *of* beleeving parents, (*together with the rest of his* sheep) *to receive the* substance *of all his* ordinances, *the* accomplishment *of all his* promises, *the* enjoyment *of that* glorious *and* immortall estate, *that* ununchangeable *and* perpetuall supreame inheritance, *which shall never be worne out, or taken away, but remaine from* everlasting *to* everlasting.

FINIS.